DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 643 EC 306 723

TITLE	Profiles of State Monitoring Systems.
INSTITUTION	Western Regional Resource Center, Eugene, OR.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1997-09-00
NOTE	79p.
CONTRACT	H028-A30003
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Children; *Compliance (Legal); *Disabilities; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Federal Legislation; Formative Evaluation; Infants; National Surveys; *Program Evaluation; *State Departments of Education; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B; *Program Monitoring

ABSTRACT

This document presents profiles of the state education agency (SEA) program monitoring systems in the 58 states and jurisdictions receiving funds under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The first section includes an overview of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) compliance monitoring review system is provided. The second section includes a large matrix comparing all states and jurisdictions is presented. The matrix covers the following areas: demographics, staffing, personnel used as part of monitoring teams, process and materials, forms, and changes. The largest portion of the document is comprised of individual state profiles. Profiles typically include contact information, a state summary, and a more detailed explanation of the state or jurisdiction's specific system of program monitoring. A matrix comparing program evaluation materials used follows the profiles. The survey sent to all SEAs is attached. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PROFILES OF STATE MONITORING SYSTEMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 423 643

September ~ 1997

Prepared by the
Regional Resource Center Program

Great Lakes Area RRC
Ohio State University
700 Ackerman Road - Suite 440
Columbus OH 43202

Mid-South RRC
University of Kentucky
126 Mineral Industries Building
Lexington KY 40506-0051

Mountain Plains RRC
Utah State University
1780 N. Research Parkway - Suite 112
Logan UT 84341-9620

Northeast RRC
Trinity College of Vermont
208 Colchester Avenue
Burlington VT 05401

South Atlantic RRC
Florida Atlantic University
1236 North University Drive
Plantation FL 33322

Western RRC
University of Oregon
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1268

DISCLAIMER

This document was developed by the Western Regional Resource Center, Eugene, Oregon, pursuant to Cooperative Agreement Number H028-A30003 with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education. Nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. [TAA# 108GENSUP]

EC 306 723

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This document was developed as a resource for State Education Agency (SEA) staff responsible for developing and improving SEA program monitoring systems for infants, children and youth with disabilities. It represents a joint effort of the Regional Resource Center Network and the many state and jurisdictional staff who submitted the information. It is an update on two earlier documents, *Profiles of State Monitoring Systems: 1992*, and *Profiles of State Monitoring Systems: 1994* which were developed for the Second and Third Annual Conferences on the Monitoring of Special Education Programs.

This edition is intended as a reference for state staff seeking information on other states' monitoring practices. Since a questionnaire was used to elicit the information, it represents generally one individual's response at a particular point in time. The reader should bear in mind the potential for changes to the information, and exercise appropriate caution in its use.

The document includes a brief overview of OSEP's monitoring system, followed by a matrix of state responses to 40 questions on staffing, monitoring processes, materials and forms, and changes in state monitoring systems. State summaries include contact information and narrative descriptions. The final section includes a display matrix and information on materials states are willing to share, and a copy of the 1997 survey.

Compiling this type of document requires a great deal of effort. Many thanks go to all of the state SEA staff who responded, to the Regional Resource Center (RRC) personnel who coordinated the data collection effort, and to Sally Wald of the Western RRC for all of her work on this project. We hope you find it helpful.

Jim Leinen (on behalf of the RRC staff listed below)

Jean Beller
Great Lakes Area RRC
Ohio State University
700 Ackerman Road - Suite 440
Columbus OH 43202

Art Cernosia and Kathleen Palmer
Northeast RRC
Trinity College of Vermont
208 Colchester Avenue
Burlington VT 05401

Debra Merchant
Mid-South RRC
University of Kentucky
126 Mineral Industries Building
Lexington KY 40506-0051

Denise Stewart
South Atlantic RRC
Florida Atlantic University
1236 North University Drive
Plantation FL 33322

John Copenhaver
Mountain Plains RRC
Utah State University
1780 N. Research Parkway - Suite 112
Logan UT 84341-9620

Jim Leinen
Western RRC
University of Oregon
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1268

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Federal Monitoring Overview 1

SEA Monitoring Profile Matrix 2

State Summaries 10

Materials Matrix 70

Materials Available 71

Survey 72

FEDERAL MONITORING OF STATES:
AN OVERVIEW OF OSEP 'S MONITORING PROCESS

According to Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Part B), the State educational agency (SEA) has responsibility for ensuring that all of the Part B requirements are carried out, and that each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the State, including each program administered by any other public agency, is under the general supervision of the SEA and meets the education standards of the SEA. The State must comply with these responsibilities through State statute, State regulation, signed agreements between respective agency officials, or other documents.

To ensure that SEAs are carrying out their responsibilities and implementing the policies and procedures required under Part B, the U.S. Department of Education, through its Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), implements a comprehensive compliance monitoring review system. OSEP's monitoring activities emphasize the on-going collection, review and analysis of information to ensure full implementation of Federal requirements including the verification of policies and procedures set forth in the State Plan. OSEP comprehensive monitoring site-visits also focus on a careful review of policies and procedures which document that the Federal requirements are being appropriately implemented. Concurrent with the on-site visit to the SEA are site visits to subgrantees (Local education agencies and public agencies) to verify that State policies and procedures that are consistent with Federal requirements are being carried out at the local level. The overall monitoring review emphasizes those requirements that are most closely related to achieving better results for children and youth with disabilities.

Although OSEP designs each State's on-site compliance monitoring plan to be State-specific, at a minimum, each on-site review addresses the following core areas of SEA responsibility:

Free Appropriate Public Education
Least Restrictive Environment
Individualized Education Programs
Transition Services

General Supervision
- SEA monitoring
- Complaint management
- Due process hearings

OSEP's on-site monitoring plan is designed to address unique compliance or implementation concerns that come to the attention of the monitoring team through State Plan review, review of interagency agreements, former monitoring reports, corrective action plans, complaints, written inquiries, public hearings, and/or additional information obtained during pre-site visits.

Upon the completion of the on-site monitoring review OSEP assesses compliance through the analysis of all information obtained during the monitoring process. A report is then issued to the SEA. The report includes an invitation to the SEA to propose/negotiate corrective actions that the State will take in order to meet Federal requirements. This may include the revision of policies, procedures, regulations, and State practices. Corrective action products are submitted to OSEP for approval. The products are then evaluated by OSEP for their sufficiency in meeting the required corrective actions and based upon OSEP's approval of the products and written assurance by the State that required corrective actions will be implemented, the Corrective Actions are approved and the monitoring process is completed. Based on a variety of criteria, including the severity of the violations, OSEP may conduct follow-up monitoring activities to verify the effectiveness of corrective actions.

	QUESTION STATE	AK	AR	AS	AZ
	Demographics				
1 a	Number of LEAs that must be monitored	53	311	1	225
1 b	Number of IEUs that must be monitored	0		N/A	0
1 c	Number of other state entities that must be monitored	2	9		
1 d	Number of chartered schools that must be monitored	0			200
1 e	Number of private entities that must be monitored	1			
2	IDEA child count for ages 3 - 21	17,598	55,454	370	79,465
3	Agency that monitors Part C (see narrative)				
	Staffing				
4 a	Located in SEA Central Office	1	6	0.1	8.4
4 b	Located elsewhere		5	0	3
	Personnel used as part of monitoring team				
5	SEA staff (regardless of office location)	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	LEA peers	N	Y	N	N
7	Parents	N	N	N	N
8	Others	N	N	N	N
	Process & Materials				
9	Current cycle (in years) for comprehensive on-site visits	5	3	4	8
10	Child count verification is part of our on-site process	Y	Y	Y	Y
11	We use focused/targeted monitoring	Y	Y	N	Y
12	LEA self-mon. is a part of our process	N	Y	N	Y
13	Our IDEA mon. is conducted in conjunction with other SEA monitoring	Y	N	Y	N
14	Our mon. is conducted in conjunction with the Part C Lead Agency	N	N	N	N
15	Our mon. goes beyond legal oblig. to include prog. quality/effectiveness	N	Y	N	Y
16	Our mon. goes beyond legal oblig. to include student outcomes/results	N	N	N	N
17	We provide TA as a formal part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	Y	Y
18	We formally collect information from parents	Y	N	N	Y
19	We use a computer database of LEA data for off-site monitoring	N	Y	N	N
20	We use computers during on-site process	Y	N	N	N
21	We generate our reports using computer templates	Y	Y	N	N
22	LEA application review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	N	Y
23	LEA policy/procedure review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	N	Y
24	LEA interagency agreements review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	N	N
25	We use sanctions other than fiscal sanctions	Y		N	N
26	We have written interpretive standards for assessing compliance	Y	Y	N	Y
27	We have written criteria for selecting LEAs to be monitored	Y	Y	Y	Y
28	We have an instruction/training manual for monitors	N	Y	N	Y
29	We use a consistent sampling formula for student records	N	Y	N	Y
30	We conduct follow-up monitoring	N	Y	N	Y
	Forms				
31	We have standardized forms available for LEA adoption	Y	Y	Y	Y
32	We have and use an LEA policy and procedure review form	N	Y	Y	Y
33	Our IEP record review form goes beyond compliance issues	N	N	N	N
34	We have and use interview forms specifically for monitoring	N	Y	N	Y
35	We have and use mail or telephone survey forms	Y	N	N	Y
36	We have and use a summary checklist (to integrate findings)	N	Y	Y	Y
37	We have and use a standardized monitoring report/narrative format	Y	Y	N	Y
	Changes				
38	We have made adaptations in our mon. to address early childhood issues	N	Y	N	Y
39	We have made adaptations in our mon. system to include Part C mon.	N	N	N	N
40	We are making or considering major revisions to our system	Y	Y	Y	N

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIA	CA	CO	CT	DE	FL	GA	GU	HI	IA	ID
23	1,000+	54	169	19	67	182	35	7	378	112
0			N/A	0	N/A	0			15	0
0	3	3	6	2	7	44	2	1	9	18
0			N/A	1	N/A				0	0
0		86	N/A	5	N/A					10
		71,530	77,400	15,000	322,810	141,149		15,500	68,026	25,196
1	4	3	4	1	3	5	0.75	1	2.5	1
3			N/A	0	0	0	0		0	2.25
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
4	4	5	5	3	4	5	3	3	3	5
Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N	Y
N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		N
N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N/A	Y	N	Y
Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	QUESTION STATE	IL	IN	KS	KY
	Demographics				
1 a	Number of LEAs that must be monitored		65	305	176
1 b	Number of IEUs that must be monitored	97			
1 c	Number of other state entities that must be monitored	3	6	8	27
1 d	Number of chartered schools that must be monitored				
1 e	Number of private entities that must be monitored			9	
2	IDEA child count for ages 3 - 21	240,000	137,277	55,352	85,052
3	Agency that monitors Part C (see narrative)				
	Staffing				
4 a	Located in SEA Central Office	4	5	4	5
4 b	Located elsewhere	4	N/A	0	0
	Personnel used as part of monitoring team				
5	SEA staff (regardless of office location)	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	LEA peers	Y	Y	Y	Y
7	Parents	N	N	N	N
8	Others	N	Y	Y	Y
	Process & Materials				
9	Current cycle (in years) for comprehensive on-site visits	6	5	5	5
10	Child count verification is part of our on-site process	Y	Y	N	N
11	We use focused/targeted monitoring	Y	N	N	N
12	LEA self-mon. is a part of our process	N	N	N	Y
13	Our IDEA mon. is conducted in conjunction with other SEA monitoring	N	Y	Y	Y
14	Our mon. is conducted in conjunction with the Part C Lead Agency	N	N	N	N
15	Our mon. goes beyond legal oblig. to include prog. quality/effectiveness	N	N	Y	N
16	Our mon. goes beyond legal oblig. to include student outcomes/results	N	N	Y	N
17	We provide TA as a formal part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	Y	Y
18	We formally collect information from parents	Y	Y	Y	Y
19	We use a computer database of LEA data for off-site monitoring	N	Y	N	Y
20	We use computers during on-site process	N	Y	Y	N
21	We generate our reports using computer templates	Y	Y	Y	N
22	LEA application review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	N	Y	Y
23	LEA policy/procedure review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	Y	Y
24	LEA interagency agreements review is a part of our monitoring process	N	Y	Y	N
25	We use sanctions other than fiscal sanctions	N	Y	Y	Y
26	We have written interpretive standards for assessing compliance	Y	Y	N	Y
27	We have written criteria for selecting LEAs to be monitored	Y	N	N	Y
28	We have an instruction/training manual for monitors	Y	Y	Y	Y
29	We use a consistent sampling formula for student records	Y	Y	Y	Y
30	We conduct follow-up monitoring	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Forms				
31	We have standardized forms available for LEA adoption	Y	Y	Y	Y
32	We have and use an LEA policy and procedure review form	Y	Y	Y	N
33	Our IEP record review form goes beyond compliance issues	N	N	Y	N
34	We have and use interview forms specifically for monitoring	Y	Y	Y	Y
35	We have and use mail or telephone survey forms	Y	Y	Y	Y
36	We have and use a summary checklist (to integrate findings)	Y	Y	Y	N
37	We have and use a standardized monitoring report/narrative format	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Changes				
38	We have made adaptations in our mon. to address early childhood issues	Y	Y	Y	Y
39	We have made adaptations in our mon. system to include Part C mon.	N	N	N	N
40	We are making or considering major revisions to our system	Y	N	Y	N

LA	MD	MA	ME	MI	MN	MS	MO	MT	NC	ND
66	24	350	160		360	151	525	349	119	234
N/A		35		57				36		31
3	5			3	5	14	6	4	30	5
N/A		22			20	0		0	35	0
N/A	88	150	25			18		4		5
92,772	104,630	159,023	33,055		100,000	64,989	125,641	18,606	152,819	12,710
0	4.5	16	4	1	10	5	13	4.92	3	1.32
0	0	0	0			0	2.83	0	0	
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
4	3	7	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5
N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
N	N	N	N		Y	N	N	N	N	N
N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
N	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	N	N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N

	QUESTION / STATE	NE	NM	NV	NH
	Demographics				
1 a	Number of LEAs that must be monitored	649	89	17	74
1 b	Number of IEUs that must be monitored	N/A	0		
1 c	Number of other state entities that must be monitored	N/A	8	1	
1 d	Number of chartered schools that must be monitored	N/A	5		
1 e	Number of private entities that must be monitored	N/A	0		35
2	IDEA child count for ages 3 - 21	39,879	49,141	29,972	
3	Agency that monitors Part C (see narrative)				
	Staffing				
4 a	Located in SEA Central Office	2	1.2	1	1
4 b	Located elsewhere	2.25	0		
	Personnel used as part of monitoring team				
5	SEA staff (regardless of office location)	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	LEA peers	N	Y	Y	Y
7	Parents	N	N		Y
8	Others	N	N	Y	Y
	Process & Materials				
9	Current cycle (in years) for comprehensive on-site visits	5	3	3	5
10	Child count verification is part of our on-site process	Y	Y	Y	N
11	We use focused/targeted monitoring	Y	Y	N	N
12	LEA self-mon. is a part of our process	N	Y	Y	Y
13	Our IDEA mon. is conducted in conjunction with other SEA monitoring	N	Y	N	N
14	Our mon. is conducted in conjunction with the Part C Lead Agency	Y	N	N	
15	Our mon. goes beyond legal oblig. to include prog. quality/effectiveness	N	Y	Y	N
16	Our mon. goes beyond legal oblig. to include student outcomes/results	N	Y	N	Y
17	We provide TA as a formal part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	N	Y
18	We formally collect information from parents	N	Y	Y	Y
19	We use a computer database of LEA data for off-site monitoring	Y	Y	Y	N
20	We use computers during on-site process	N	Y	N	Y
21	We generate our reports using computer templates	Y	Y	N	
22	LEA application review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	Y	Y
23	LEA policy/procedure review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	Y	Y
24	LEA interagency agreements review is a part of our monitoring process	N	N	N	N
25	We use sanctions other than fiscal sanctions	N	Y	N	N
26	We have written interpretive standards for assessing compliance	Y	N	N	Y
27	We have written criteria for selecting LEAs to be monitored	Y	N	N	Y
28	We have an instruction/training manual for monitors	Y	Y	N	Y
29	We use a consistent sampling formula for student records	Y	N	Y	N
30	We conduct follow-up monitoring	Y	Y	N	Y
	Forms				
31	We have standardized forms available for LEA adoption	Y	N	N	Y
32	We have and use an LEA policy and procedure review form	Y	Y	Y	Y
33	Our IEP record review form goes beyond compliance issues	N	N	N	N
34	We have and use interview forms specifically for monitoring	N	Y	Y	Y
35	We have and use mail or telephone survey forms	N	N	Y	Y
36	We have and use a summary checklist (to integrate findings)	Y	N	Y	Y
37	We have and use a standardized monitoring report/narrative format	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Changes				
38	We have made adaptations in our mon. to address early childhood issues	N	N	N	Y
39	We have made adaptations in our mon. system to include Part C mon.	Y	N	N	Y
40	We are making or considering major revisions to our system	N	Y	N	Y

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NJ	NY	OH	OK	OR	PA	PR	RI	SC	SD	TN
585	715	611	548	398	501	100	38	86	177	138
36	38						30	14	37	0
3	55	85	2				3	6	0	4
17	0	0						N/A	0	0
145	516	0					25	0	0	60
202,400	412,705	225,957	73,857	70,094	215,448	46,154	26,600	90,762	15,051	125,519
1	1	10	6.1	3.7		1	1.5	7	6	2
20	42		2	0.5			0.5	N/A	3	6
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
4	7	7	4	6	5	3	5	4	4	5
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N/A	Y	N	N	N
Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N/A	N	Y	Y	Y
	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N/A	N	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N	Y	Y
N	N	N	N	Y	N/A	N/A	N	N	N	N
N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	QUESTION STATE	TX	UT	VT	VA
	Demographics				
1 a	Number of LEAs that must be monitored	1,043	40	61	134
1 b	Number of IEUs that must be monitored	20	0	0	
1 c	Number of other state entities that must be monitored	12	1	2	
1 d	Number of chartered schools that must be monitored	17		0	
1 e	Number of private entities that must be monitored	30	6	0	
2	IDEA child count for ages 3 - 21	444,290	53,876	12,015	144,224
3	Agency that monitors Part C (see narrative)				
	Staffing				
4 a	Located in SEA Central Office	6	1	2.2	2
4 b	Located elsewhere	35	3.5	0	
	Personnel used as part of monitoring team				
5	SEA staff (regardless of office location)	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	LEA peers	Y	N	Y	Y
7	Parents	N	N	N	
8	Others	Y	Y	N	Y
	Process & Materials				
9	Current cycle (in years) for comprehensive on-site visits	5	5	6	6
10	Child count verification is part of our on-site process	Y	N	Y	Y
11	We use focused/targeted monitoring	Y	Y	Y	Y
12	LEA self-mon. is a part of our process	Y	N	N	Y
13	Our IDEA mon. is conducted in conjunction with other SEA monitoring	Y	Y	N	Y
14	Our mon. is conducted in conjunction with the Part C Lead Agency	N	N	N	N
15	Our mon. goes beyond legal oblig. to include prog. quality/effectiveness	Y	Y	N	N
16	Our mon. goes beyond legal oblig. to include student outcomes/results	Y	N	Y	N
17	We provide TA as a formal part of our monitoring process	N	Y	Y	Y
18	We formally collect information from parents	Y	Y	Y	N
19	We use a computer database of LEA data for off-site monitoring	Y	Y	N	N
20	We use computers during on-site process	Y	Y	N	N
21	We generate our reports using computer templates	Y	Y	Y	Y
22	LEA application review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	Y	Y
23	LEA policy/procedure review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	Y	Y	Y
24	LEA interagency agreements review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	N	N	N
25	We use sanctions other than fiscal sanctions	Y	N	Y	N
26	We have written interpretive standards for assessing compliance	Y	Y	Y	N
27	We have written criteria for selecting LEAs to be monitored	Y	Y	Y	Y
28	We have an instruction/training manual for monitors	Y	Y	Y	Y
29	We use a consistent sampling formula for student records	Y	Y	Y	N
30	We conduct follow-up monitoring	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Forms				
31	We have standardized forms available for LEA adoption	Y	N	Y	Y
32	We have and use an LEA policy and procedure review form	Y	Y	N	N
33	Our IEP record review form goes beyond compliance issues	N	N	N	N
34	We have and use interview forms specifically for monitoring	Y	Y	Y	Y
35	We have and use mail or telephone survey forms	Y	Y	Y	N
36	We have and use a summary checklist (to integrate findings)	Y	Y	Y	N
37	We have and use a standardized monitoring report/narrative format	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Changes				
38	We have made adaptations in our mon. to address early childhood issues	Y	Y	Y	N
39	We have made adaptations in our mon. system to include Part C mon.	Y	N	N	N
40	We are making or considering major revisions to our system	Y	Y	Y	Y

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WA	WI	WV	WY
296	428	55	48
0			18
6	2	7	1
0			1
0	40		6
106,994	110,413	47,317	
0.5	8.2	4	3
See Nrtv	1	0	
N	Y	Y	Y
N	N	Y	Y
N	N	N	N
Y	N	Y	Y
3	6	4	5
N	N	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	N
N	N	Y	Y
N	N	N	Y
N	N	N	N
N	N	N	Y
N	N	N	N
N	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	Y	N
Y	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	Y
N	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	Y
N	N	Y	Y
Y	N	N	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y
N	N	Y	Y
Y	N	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y
N	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	N	Y
Y	N	Y	N
N	N	Y	N
Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	Y	N
Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	N	Y	Y
N	N	N	Y
N	Y	N	Y

ALABAMA

Alabama State Department of Education
Special Education Services
P O Box 302101
Montgomery AL 36130-2101

Telephone: (334) 242-8114
Fax: (334) 242-9192
E-Mail: clester@sdenet.alsde.edu
SEA Web Address: www.alsde.edu/

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Cynthia Lester
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Rehabilitation Services

Summary: The purpose for conducting continuous special education program review activities is to ensure that providers of special education services have quality programs for all students with disabilities. The process has been developed to ensure appropriate special education services through continuous program review and compliance activities. The emphasis is on the development of sound educational and program management practices and the prevention of compliance deficits. Since this process is continuous, any of the review activities may occur at any time as deemed necessary. One or more staff members from the Division of Special Education Services (DSES) may be specifically identified to visit a local education agency at any time to obtain information, review programs and/or to verify compliance. By working together, all local education agencies can avoid problems that could lead to corrective action or withholding of funds.

The Program Review Procedures for LEAs are composed of four levels of continuous review activities including data gathering, staffings, technical assistance, corrective action and withholding procedures.

Level 1: Information is gathered to gain a comprehensive view of the local education agency's special education program. Data are obtained from information that is already on file in the DOE, information that must be submitted to the DSES by the LEA and information that is obtained from on-site visits. All of the information regarding LEAs is maintained in a system file within the Division of Special Education Services. A list of types of information that are maintained is available.

Parent Interviews: Questionnaires regarding the special education process are sent to parents, randomly selected by computer, based on identified students in an LEA. Practices Supporting Successful Teaching (PSST): Should DSES staff be aware of any promising practices being implemented in a LEA, LEA staff will be requested to prepare a brief summary with DSES staff that can be shared with other LEAs. Culmination Visit: Prior to Level 2 activities, there will be a final visit, if needed, made to the LEA. Any remaining information that is required for the Level 2 staffing will be collected at this time.

Level 2: Once the information has been collected and organized, selected representatives from the five sections of DSES will meet to review the data collected, discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the LEA as they relate to expected outcomes and prepare a letter regarding the status of compliance. The emphasis in this level is an opportunity to correct area(s) of noncompliance. The LEA has the opportunity to eliminate the area(s) before Level 3 is implemented. If within 90 days substantial and continuous progress is not being made, the

LEA Superintendent is contacted. No LEA will go without a review for more than a twenty-four month period.

Level 3: If the LEA is unable or unwilling to implement the activities in Levels 1 and 2, the DSES provides written notification to the LEA superintendent advising that they have ten (10) days to implement the actions required.

Level 4: When an LEA has failed to provide appropriate educational services to students with disabilities as specified through program review, formal complaint resolution, impartial due process hearing order, LEA Plan, or state and/or federal law and regulations, procedures are implemented to withhold the LEA'S federal special education funds.

The State Department of Education (SDE) ensures that each LEA or other state agency aggrieved by activities conducted by the SDE will have the benefit of procedures for requesting a review and investigation of allegation(s) of substance.

ALASKA

Alaska State Department of Education
Teaching and Learning Support
Special Education
801 West 10th Street - Suite 200
Juneau AK 99801-1894

Telephone:	(907) 465-2972
Fax:	(907) 465-3396
E-Mail:	dbrown@educ.state.ak.us
SEA Web Address:	http://www.educ.state.ak.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** DiAnn Brown
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health and Social Services

Summary: The Alaska special education handbook contains the compliance monitoring checklist. Alaska SEA staff conduct on-site monitoring of the 53 districts once every five years. Areas identified for a targeted review include: secondary transition, least restrictive environment, due process, LD severe discrepancy, evaluation of IEP goals and objectives, services for incarcerated youth, and verification of the child count for federal and state funding. On-site technical assistance is provided as requested by districts.

Changes being considered include additions to the monitoring team and inclusion of an LEA self-study. (A self evaluation tool has been piloted and is being considered for use the year prior to the on-site review.)

AMERICAN SAMOA

American Samoa Department of Education
Special Education Division
P O Box 2202
Pago Pago AS 96799

Telephone: (684) 633-1323
Fax: (684) 633-7707
E-Mail: jfrench@interwork.sdsu.edu

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Jane French
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** American Samoa Department of Health

Summary: American Samoa operates as a unitary SEA. All schools are directly administered and monitored by the DOE. All IEPs are reviewed annually, child counts are taken and annual progress reports are compiled for the Department of Education. A monitoring system has been approved by OSEP but is not yet operational. A plan for implementation is currently being developed. It will be a school based system with most of the monitoring activities carried out by the program specialists.

ARIZONA

Arizona State Department of Education
Exceptional Student Services
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix AZ 85007

Telephone: (602) 542-4831
Fax: (602) 542-5404
E-Mail: borland@mail1.ade.state.az.us
SEA Web Address: www.ade.state.az.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Bobbie Orlando
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Economic Security

Summary: The Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS) views monitoring as a continual, on going process. Through its monitoring function, the ADE/ESS maintains the responsibility for ensuring that all school districts and other public agencies carry out federal and state special education legal requirements related to the provision of a free appropriate public education for all eligible students with disabilities ages 3 through 21.

ADE/ESS has implemented an on-site monitoring system that provides two alternatives: (1) the Standard Monitoring Review or (2) the Collaborative Program Review (CPR). The CPR carries out the monitoring process as a collaborative, conjoint effort between the school district and the ADE/ESS. The CPR goes beyond procedural compliance and adds a second focus on program improvement. This system allows the opportunity to make procedural changes within overall systemic changes for the purpose of improving programs and services for children.

Monitoring procedures and activities carried out during the 8-year continuous monitoring cycle include submission and review of Entitlement Applications, Completion Reports, Special Education Census Data, and Federal Data Tables. Complaint investigations, telephone communications, meetings, and written correspondence provide other sources of annual and on-going information regarding the status of special education programs and services within Arizona. Focused monitoring may occur when specific problems are identified as a result of continuous monitoring activities. In addition, technical assistance and training are available from the ADE/ESS during each year of the monitoring cycle. A review of special education policies, procedures and forms is also completed at least once during the 8-year monitoring cycle, and more often if changes occur.

ARKANSAS

Arkansas Department of Education
State Education Building; Room 105-C
4 State Capitol Mall
Little Rock AR 72291-1071

Telephone: (501) 682-4225
Fax: (501) 682-4313
E-Mail: mcrowley@arkedu.k12.ar.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Michael Crowley, Ed.D.
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Developmental Disabilities Services

Summary: The Arkansas Department of Education, Special Education, is required to monitor all educational programs serving school-aged students with disabilities and to take appropriate actions whenever a program is found to be in noncompliance with state and/or federal regulations. There are various ways in which this activity can be accomplished depending on the philosophy of the state education agency.

Given that: 1) Monitoring is a mechanism for determining the level at which a district is in compliance with state and/or federal regulations; and 2) Monitoring is a mechanism for determining the technical assistance needs of a district, the Arkansas Department of Education, Special Education, has established the philosophy that monitoring is for the purpose of assisting a district with being in compliance.

As a part of this philosophy, the determination of whether a district is in compliance is crucial. It is important to note that the monitoring manual used by the Section refers to "pattern and practice." Compliance or noncompliance is <u>not</u> determined by a percentage of items that are determined to be present, or not present. This is a quantitative method which may have merit, but is not the method which has been adopted by the Section.

It is important to note that in establishing "pattern and practice" individual items are not what determines compliance or noncompliance. "Pattern and Practice" is determined by looking at the patterns that are established by the presence or absence of individual items and/or the practices that exist within a district. Consequently, it would be inappropriate to develop a corrective action plan based solely on the fact that six (6) out of 276 items were determined to be missing. If, however, all six (6) items represent the same concept and establish a pattern of omission or misinterpretation (practice) then corrective actions are warranted. For example,

all six (6) items indicate lack of parent notice or referral. This becomes a pattern that suggests that notices are not provided and/or not documented.

It should also be noted that in determining "pattern and practice" that the district as a whole may be in substantial compliance while a building and/or buildings within the district may have patterns of noncompliance. When this occurs, the distinction is made when reporting to the district and establishing corrective actions.

It is recognized that looking for "pattern and practices" is more difficult than using a purely quantitative system. It is also recognized that this requires a higher level of understanding of professional judgment. In the long run, this is a more constructive manner for assessing a district and providing technical assistance.

For the purpose of this document, "pattern" and "practice" are defined as:
Pattern - repetitive, occurs over and over again, more than once;
Practice - what is occurring. Different from the pattern.

As an example, a district may have the pattern that parents receive prior notice. However, the practice may be that the notice was given over the phone and documented as if mailed. Pattern and practice may not equate to the same action.

The primary function of the monitoring unit is to be of assistance to districts while carrying out its regulatory function. This does not mean that noncompliance will be ignored. It does mean that assistance will be offered whenever noncompliance is determined. Only after timelines for coming into compliance have passed and conditions still exist which indicate continued noncompliance will procedures be initiated to impose sanctions on a district. Supervisors do not have the authority to apply sanctions beyond a compliance action plan. They are to recommend further actions to the coordinator should the compliance action plan not be implemented. Further sanctions will be imposed at the direction of the Associate Director of Special Education.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Branch of Exceptional Education
Department of Interior
1849 C Street NW - Room 3525 - MIB 523
Washington DC 20240-4000

Telephone:	(202) 208-4976
	(801) 755-4797
Fax:	(202) 208-3312

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Ken Whitehorn
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Branch of Exceptional Education (Except under new law the Branch is not responsible)

Summary: The Branch of Exceptional Education monitors the operation of special education programs at the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) using contract monitors located at Utah State University. The agencies are monitored once every four years. The monitoring process consists of the following parts: periodic reviews of Agency Comprehensive Plans to determine if the unit's policies/procedures reflect Federal regulations; comprehensive review and

analysis of evaluation reports, applications, and other pertinent information; on-site visits to residential child care facilities, institutions and other programs offering services to disabled Indian children who have been placed by the BIA (each facility is monitored at least once every three years); periodic on-site review of the Agency and school programs to determine the extent of implementation and/or the quality of services.

During on-site visits monitor(s) meet in an entrance interview with the local administrator and staff to outline procedures and answer questions regarding monitoring activities. In addition, IEPs and other relevant education records are reviewed to determine compliance. Monitors also review fiscal data, observe classroom activities, complete the monitoring checklist, and discuss and explain the findings, recommendations and timelines.

A written report that includes findings, recommendations for improvement, and compliance timelines is submitted to the Agency Education Line Officer within 60 days following the on-site review. A response must be returned within 30 days with an action plan to correct inconsistencies. A copy of the response is filed at the Office of Indian Education Programs Branch of Exceptional Education. Follow-up on-site visits will occur to assist in the corrective action of specific findings. Monitors may withhold funds for non-compliance, but only after an attempt is made to correct these deficiencies through technical assistance, training, or other administrative action. Standardized special education forms are also available for LEA adoption.

CALIFORNIA

California Department of Education
Special Education Division, Early Start
515 L Street, Room 270
Sacramento CA 95814

Telephone: (916) 327-3505
Fax: (916) 327-3516
E-Mail: thawthorne@cde.ca.gov

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Ted Hawthorne
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** California Department of Education

Summary: The California Department of Education Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) process began in 1981. Its purpose is to simplify, streamline, and coordinate the legally required compliance monitoring of specially funded programs and simultaneously maintain a commitment to students with special needs. The goals of the CCR process are to:

1. Decrease multiple compliance monitoring visits by the CDE in LEAs;
2. Increase local responsibility for compliance by encouraging participating LEAs and schools to conduct a compliance self review prior to CDE staff validation;
3. Ensure that categorically funded students are provided the district's core curriculum; and
4. Provide technical and management assistance to LEAs in preventing and resolving noncompliance problems.

The CCR monitors the following specially funded educational programs: CalServe; child development; consolidated programs; Eisenhower professional development; migrant education; special education; career/vocational education and civil right reviews; adult education; safe and drug free communities; tobacco education programs; and gender equity

programs. When a district is identified for a compensatory education preschool review or special education early intervention review, these reviews will be incorporated as part of the CCR. A separate instrument for the compensatory education preschool review is available, upon request, through the CCR Management Office. Approximately one-fourth of the state's LEAs and their associated regional agencies are monitored each year by means of a single coordinated compliance review.

There are two phases in the CCR process: LEA self-review and state validation review. CCRs are additionally conducted at five different types of LEAs or regional agencies: school districts; consolidated programs cooperatives; county offices; special education local plan areas (SELPAs); and migrant education regional offices. Although the steps of self review and validation review are generally the same for each type of review, unique characteristics are described below:

- School District CCR. The most common type of CCR. Depending on the size of the district and number of specially funded programs operated, state validation teams are composed of two to seven people spending from two to four days in the district.

- County Office CCR. County offices frequently administer some of the CCR specially funded programs. In this situation, the county office receives a CCR.

- SELPA CCR. When a SELPA includes more than one district, a SELPA review is scheduled which begins with a special education administrative review. Administrative reviews take up to one day and are usually scheduled immediately preceding the first school district's CCR. Results of these reviews are held until all the districts in the SELPA have completed their CCRs and time is then scheduled to meet with the SELPA staff and member school districts to present the findings.

A variation of the CCR process a, document review, is available to school districts that meet specific criteria. The document review process does not involve classroom observation nor does it include the integrated programs item (IPI). District staff must provide self review and supporting documentation to the CDE and be prepared to discuss all relevant compliance issues. If it is clear that a thorough self review was not conducted, or did not appropriately identify compliance issues, an on-site CCR may be scheduled. A special supplement to the CCR Training Guide has been created for districts receiving document reviews. This supplement is provided during training institutes for LEAs in the fall of each year.

To qualify for a document review, a school district must meet the following criteria:

- Have fewer than 100 compensatory education students, fewer than 100 limited English proficient students, and fewer than 100 special education students;
- Was not found to have substantial noncompliance issues during the last CCR; and
- Resolved any prior CCR issues in a timely manner.

What makes our system unique is that it is a coordinated system with a focus on the core curriculum, access for all students, supplemental program services to support students learning of the core, coordination, and a summation of assessment data to show that students are learning. This year, there is a change in criteria for site selection based upon established criteria that includes student performance outcomes and history of compliance and complaints. All sites conduct a self review. Distinguished schools are also considered as part of the selection process.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS (CNMI)

CNMI State Board of Education
Public School System
Special Education Programs
P O Box 1370, CK
CNMI
Saipan MP 96950

Telephone: (670) 322-9956 / (670) 322-9590
Fax: (670) 322-4056

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Suzanne Lizama
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Public School System

Summary: The Public School system is currently in the process of restructuring its monitoring system with input from the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). It is anticipated that conduct of monitoring activities will be contracted out in the future under supervision of the Special Education Director.

COLORADO

Colorado State Department of Education
Special Education Services Unit
201 East Colfax Avenue
Denver CO 80203

Telephone: (303) 866-6702
Fax: (303) 866-6811
E-Mail: t_connolly@ceo.cudenver.edu
SEA Web Address: www.cde.state.co.us/
SpecialNet: COSESU

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Terri Rogers-Connolly
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Colorado Department of Education

Summary: The Colorado Department of Education is responsible for a comprehensive monitoring system which includes the following activities implemented within a five year cycle:

Year 1: Count audit (record reviews to check compliance with eligibility criteria for federal count reports);

Year 2: A file review of complaints/hearings/technical assistance and other data sources routinely collected by the Department are utilized as an information base in planning for the comprehensive on-site visitation. Also, submission of a local comprehensive plan (which describes how each administrative unit will comply with the state plan) occurs during this same year;

Year 3: A planned, comprehensive on-site visitation is conducted to check compliance as well as to determine local needs and provide technical assistance regarding program quality and effectiveness;

Year 4: Follow-up (concentrates technical assistance and resources toward those areas identified as corrective actions and specific compliance/concerns during the comprehensive on-site visitation);

Year 5: Targeted on-site (focus is on checking to assure the administrative unit has completed all corrective actions identified as a result of the comprehensive on-site).

The entire monitoring cycle is based on a system of checks and balances. We have continued to streamline the process, but when steps have been shortened or reduced, items have been missed. As districts have been involved in restructuring, it has been important to hold up the entire system of education to profile its beliefs about the way all students should be served and supported. This sets the parameters within the unit about how special education services are delivered. During the comprehensive on-site, teams do include a variety of members including parents of children with disabilities, university personnel and instructional providers from the field. We do use targeted approaches in year 5 as a way of touching base with the administrative units to assure corrective actions regarding compliance items have been resolved. Technical assistance is an ongoing part of our monitoring cycle and the intensity varies from year to year. During the comprehensive on-site, technical assistance is targeted toward all educators and parents. While we continue to refine the process, major changes in the way we do monitoring are not expected. However, we do want to shift our focus towards student outcomes and measurement of progress, particularly as standards-based education evolves in this state.

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut State Department of Education
Bureau of Special Education and Pupil Services
25 Industrial Park Road
Middletown CT 06457

Telephone: (860) 638-4178
Fax: (860) 638-4231

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Anne Louise Thompson
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Connecticut State Department of Mental Retardation

Summary: The Bureau of Special Education and Pupil Services has the equivalent of 4.5 FTE Education Consultants assigned to program compliance review activities. These consultants review public school districts every six years and private schools every five years. Smaller districts are generally reviewed by a single consultant while larger districts are visited by a team.

The program compliance review process focuses on the following areas:

1. Verification of district IDEA-B child counts based on a randomly selected sample of special education students;
2. Verification that students are receiving the services specified in their IEPs;
3. A review of the district's special education policy and procedure manual to verify compliance with applicable state and federal regulations;
4. Review of IEP documents for quality and completeness;
5. Review of additional student files based on specific issues identified during the current district review or during prior statewide program reviews;
6. Interviews with district staff when issues identified during the reviews require clarification or verification; and
7. A discussion/analysis with district administrative staff of any atypical patterns in extended school year services, written prior notice, prevalence rates, identification of students by

specific categories, out-of-district and private school placement rates, and exemption rates from state mandated basic skills mastery test; compliance with principles of Least Restrictive Environment; and other specific issues identified through the Program Review Process.

Districts are scheduled for monitoring and invited to orientation sessions to prepare for the review twelve months prior to the planned site visit. Additional training is provided following the review for districts with noncompliance issues. In addition, a series of training sessions is held each year for any new directors and supervisors of special education.

On an annual basis, monitoring documents/procedures are reviewed and, if necessary, revised. During the year, monthly unit meetings are held to train monitoring staff, review activities, discuss issues relative to monitoring procedures, and consider any needed changes in monitoring practices.

DELAWARE

Delaware Department of Education
Exceptional Children & Early Childhood Group
P O Box 1402
Townsend Building
Dover DE 19903

Telephone: (302) 739-4667
Fax: (302) 739-2388
Email: tpledgie@state.de.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Thomas K. Pledgie, Ph.D
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health & Social Services

Summary: During the 1996-97 school year Delaware's Comprehensive Compliance Monitoring System (CCMS) underwent revision. The process involves eight (8) distinct elements:

1. A review of each district and agency's Local Operational Plan;
2. A review of all complaints and hearings that have occurred over the last two years;
3. A detailed examination of IEPs of selected students from all LEAs during October of each year;
4. A comprehensive site visit to selected districts and agencies which involves a review of student records;
5. Classroom visits to authenticate that instruction is both specially designed and consistent with the IEP;
6. Surveys of parents;
7. Interviews with and/or surveys of central office personnel, special and regular education teachers, and related services personnel; and
8. Intensive review of all financial documents related to federal projects.

The overall CCMS is a two phase process, as follows:

Phase 1. The September Audit is conducted by Department of Education (DOE) staff during the month of October of each year as part of an agreement between DOE and the State

legislature to visit all Districts and authenticate the September 30 count of students with disabilities.

Phase 1 has two major components: to validate Districts'/agencies' count of the number of students with disabilities who are enrolled, by disability, and by hours of service; and to conduct a thorough review of students' IEPs to ensure that they are complete, based on the student's needs and were the basis for the placement decision.

Phase 2. The District/Agency Site Visit involves selecting District and/or Agency schools and interviewing staff, reviewing policies and procedures, examining student folders, and ensuring that federal funds are expended according to the District or Agency's approved project. The State has recently accelerated from a five (5) to a three (3) year review cycle (Item #11). These intensive visits are designed to gather data (beyond that gathered during Phase 1) that will verify that all relevant policies and procedures, including those related to the IEP, are appropriately and uniformly applied.

In all instances, deficiencies noted are reported to appropriate authorities at the Department of Education, as well as being contained in a written report addressed to the local chief school officer or agency leader involved. Each LEA/Agency is required to respond with a written Corrective Action Plan (CAP) designed to remedy whatever deficiencies have been identified. These corrective action plans are monitored throughout the year to ensure that corrections of deficiencies are made. Department staff are available to provide technical assistance to LEAs as needed (Item #17).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia Public Schools
State Compliance Monitoring
415 12th St. N.W. Room 900
Washington DC 20004

Telephone: (202) 724-4400
Fax: (202) 727-8810

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Harvey G. Dickerson, Chief State School Officer
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Human Services

Summary: The District of Columbia Public Schools is currently undergoing significant restructuring. Along with staff changes and program improvements, the monitoring process is being revised.

FLORIDA

Florida Department of Education
Division of Public Schools and Community Education
Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services
614 Turlington Building
Tallahassee FL 32399-0400

Telephone: (850) 488-1379
Fax: (850) 487-2194

E-Mail Peacocm@mail.doe.state.fl.us
SEA Web Site: http://www.firn.edu/doe/doehome.htm

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Martha Peacock, Cathy Bishop
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health, Children's Medical Services

Summary: 1997-98 represents a transition year for monitoring in Florida. In prior years, only 25% of the 67 school districts were monitored each year. Monitoring addressed compliance issues such as eligibility, procedural safeguards, IEPs, and the use of state and federal funds. Monitoring was accomplished through a self-evaluation procedure whereby school level and district level personnel reviewed critical components of their exceptional student education programs. These personnel completed detailed work papers and developed a summary of their findings. Following the self-evaluation, bureau staff members went on-site to verify a sample of the records and materials reviewed by the district. The on-site component was conducted as part of the Division of Public Schools and Community Services' comprehensive review of selected district programs.

Because Florida is implementing a revised state funding model during 1997-98, and in consideration of the reauthorization of IDEA, an interim monitoring procedure is being implemented. For the 17 districts scheduled to be monitored in 1997-98, the majority of the compliance monitoring will be conducted by self-evaluation. District and school-based staff will complete the work papers in all areas of compliance for a pre-determined sample of students and develop a report compiling their findings and proposing corrective actions as appropriate. Bureau staff will review the district's findings and corrective actions, verify findings as needed, assist the district in revising corrective actions as appropriate, and review the status of implementation of the corrective actions approximately 90 days following the submission of the completed report. These activities will be conducted independently of the Division's activities.

In addition to the compliance monitoring activities, bureau staff will implement a series of "quality assurance" activities designed to ensure accountability relative to the implementation of the revised state funding model. These activities will involve all 67 districts and a substantial number of on-site visits. Quality assurance activities will include (but are not limited to) unannounced on-site visits to observe training relative to the new model, analysis of each district's proposed distribution of program cost factors and assistance to districts in accurate interpretation and reporting, and interviews and focus groups to assess perceptions of administrators, teachers, and parents regarding the new model.

During this year, staff will assess the efficacy of the quality assurance activities, review the changes that will need to be made as a result of IDEA implementation, and develop revised monitoring procedures to be used beginning in 1998-99. Some of the strategies under consideration are:

- Expanding focus on systemic issues and reducing reliance on individual student records for compliance determination.
- Expanding sources of input in the monitoring process to include parents, general education teachers, administrators, and student services personnel.
- Revising the feedback mechanism to districts to acknowledge strengths and facilitate networking among districts.
- Establishing a menu of components that would be evaluated from a "quality assurance" perspective.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GEORGIA

Georgia State Department of Education
Division for Exceptional Students
1870 Twin Towers East
Atlanta GA 30334-5040

Telephone: (404) 657-9969
Fax: (404) 651-6457
E-Mail: ssnyder@gadoe.gac.peachnet.edu
SEA Web Address: http://gadoe.gac.peachnet.edu

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Sara Snyder, Federal/Program Review
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Human Resources

Summary: The program review process is divided into three components:

1. activities prior to on-site visit;
2. on-site activities; and
3. activities following the on-site visit.

Prior to the on-site visit, the local school system/state-operated program receives technical assistance, conducts its own self-study, compiles and organizes key information for review, and distributes questionnaires to be completed by agency personnel and parents.

On-site program review team activities include an entrance interview with local staff, a review of prepared materials, a review of randomly selected student records across ages and disability categories, selected personnel interviews, review of personnel and parent questionnaires, determination of preliminary findings and exit interviews.

After the on-site program review, a final program review report which includes commendations and compliance findings is prepared and mailed. A Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is then developed by the local school system or state-operated program with assistance from staff in the Division for Exceptional Students. When approved, the CAP becomes the basis for the follow-up post program review which is scheduled within one year. Technical assistance is available upon request during this time. During the post program review, implementation of the corrective actions is verified and documented.

If implementation of the corrective actions cannot be verified, follow-up activities with the local school system or state-operated program continue until implementation of the Corrective Action Plan can be verified. The release of federal funds may be delayed until verification is complete.

Revisions to the monitoring process due to IDEA reauthorization and proposed changes in the Georgia rules are currently being considered.

GUAM

Guam Department of Education
Guam Public School System
Division of Special Education
P O Box DE
Agana Guam 96910

Telephone: (671) 475-0549 / (671) 475-0555
Fax: (671) 475-0562
E-Mail: guamsped@ite.net

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring**: Vincent Leon Guerrero
- **Agency that Monitors Part C**: Department of Education

Summary: On-going self evaluation - The compliance review process is designed to enable the local school or agency to perform self-evaluations of procedures in terms of the implementation of both federal and local policies. The office of compliance expects each school and/or agency to perform annual special education self-evaluations. Through this process we ensure that programs for identified special education students are being provided according to their unique educational needs.

The on-site compliance review - The school or agency is notified of the compliance review visit two weeks before the scheduled visit. The visit lasts from 1-8 days depending on the school population. Every attempt is made to complete the following:

1. Meeting with the principal and other school representatives.
2. Logistics: student records and professional staff are chosen for analysis and interviews.
3. Document analysis: cumulative folders of students with disabilities are reviewed.
4. Validation interviews: structured interviews are conducted with school/agency, DOE staff and parents of students with disabilities.
5. Observations are conducted regarding students with disabilities, inclusion programs, itinerant services and resource programs.
6. Exit interview: findings are shared with school/agency personnel. Technical assistance needs are discussed regarding programs for students with disabilities.

Document assembly - The school or agency shall gather examples of program compliance. The Office of Compliance receives a list of the disabled students attending the school from the data control office for random selection of student records. Documentation that needs to be in place for the review includes required IEP file components.

Compliance review report - Within two weeks after the exit review the Office of Compliance issues the Compliance Review Report to the Associate Superintendents of Elementary/Secondary. Copies of the report are submitted to the school/agency, the Director of Education and the Associate Superintendent of Special Education.

This report lists the requirements that are found to be in non or partial compliance as well as commendations for areas that are found to be in compliance. The Office of Compliance not only provides technical assistance to the school during the visit but makes recommendations in the report on agencies and DOE staff members who could provide further assistance.

Approval or disapproval of response - During this process the Office of Compliance works with the Associate Superintendents in reviewing the school's response to determine approval or disapproval of proposed corrective actions.

Continuing non-compliance - If the school or agency continues to be found in non-compliance and no corrective action plan has been submitted or approved, or corrective actions have not been implemented, the Associate Superintendent notifies the Director of Education recommending adverse action. The Director of Education will implement adverse action procedures against the principal as outlined in Board Policy 914.12 and 914.14.

HAWAII

Special Education Section
Office of Accountability and School Instructional Support
3430 Leahi Avenue
Honolulu, HI 96815

Telephone: (808) 733-4990
Fax: (808) 733-4841
Web Site: http://www.pixi.com/~sped

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Charlene Graulty
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health

Summary: The Hawaii Department of Education, unique in its single state education system with a geographical distribution over seven islands, continues its monitoring efforts to proceed beyond mere compliance.

The monitoring forms include items which assist in identifying statewide needs for technical assistance, inservice training, and other staffing needs. Documentation is requested from department personnel at the district offices, principals, and special education teachers. Confidential files are examined and IEPs are reviewed with a special emphasis on the match between assessed needs and program content. The monitoring also reflects the department's focus on identifying students' strengths as well as their special educational needs, as opposed to categorically providing for students based on disability. Providing ongoing technical assistance toward these efforts benefits Hawaii's special education students.

Hawaii's monitoring team includes the ESL program manager and Title VI/Section 504 compliance officer. Through this coordinated effort, Hawaii is working toward a consolidated monitoring effort similar to that utilized through the IASA.

IDAHO

Idaho State Department of Education
Special Education Section
P O Box 83720
Boise ID 83720-0027

Telephone: (208) 332-6915
Fax: (208) 334-4664
E-Mail: jkbrenn@sde.state.id.us
SEA Web: http://www.sde.state.id.us/SpecialEd/

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Jane Brennan
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Idaho Department of Health and Welfare

Summary: The State Department of Education has adopted a five year cycle for special education compliance monitoring. Approximately one-fifth of the districts are in each phase of the cycle.

On-site Review Year - An SDE team conducts an on-site compliance review. They use data to focus areas for review prior to the visit.

Corrective Action Year - Districts and agencies implement corrective actions developed after the on-site compliance visit. The SDE will provide technical assistance as deemed necessary. The individual district or agency, however, is responsible for designing corrective action plans that correct the compliance practices found to be in error. Any involvement by the SDE staff requires prior approval.

Exemplary Program Year - The SDE in conjunction with the Idaho Association of Special Education Administrators (IASEA) conducts an exemplary/effectiveness status review after the district has had ample opportunity for compliance correction. This is by application and invitation submitted to the SDE by the school district.

Review Participation Year - A district or agency representative's participation prepares them for the future on-site review. This participation prepares them for the future on-site and familiarizes them with changes in standards that have occurred since their last on-site visit.

Self-Evaluation Year - The district conducts an in-district self-evaluation review to help prepare district personnel for the SDE on-site visit and to gather information about its strengths and weaknesses. Directors may use this information to direct change over the next couple of years.

Responses to Selected Items:

8. Personnel used as part of Monitoring Team(s) include:
We have used parents and personnel from the IHEs in the past, but as a cost cutting measure, this practice has been abandoned. The SEA does use local peers (called Field Colleagues) to assist in monitoring. These are local directors or their appointees and the training and experience allows the participant to return to their district with information to prepare for their district's review in a couple of years.

11. Focused/Targeted Monitoring:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We use data to help pinpoint areas of concern but the monitoring system covers all standards for every district rather than focusing on target areas only.

13. IDEA monitoring conducted in conjunction with other SEA monitoring:
We are investigating this option. Our initial step is to go with teams on their monitoring trips and to invite them to go with us on ours so that we can see the processes of each and are then better able to determine if they can interface into one visit.

16. Monitoring goes beyond legal obligations to include student outcomes/results:
This is something that we are investigating for possible inclusion in the future.

17. Providing TA as a formal part of the monitoring process:
Most teams will give some instruction and guidance at the exit conference depending on the pertinence for the particular audience.

ILLINOIS

Illinois State Board of Education
Division of Program Compliance
100 North First Street
Springfield IL 62777-0001

Telephone:	(217) 782-5589
Fax:	(217) 782-0372
Email:	jshook@spr6_isbe.state.il.us
SEA Web Address:	www.isbe.state.il.us
SpecialNet:	IL.SE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Jack Shook
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Illinois State Board of Education

Summary: The Department of Special Education has integrated several systems to form a unified, coordinated, and comprehensive monitoring system. The major components of this system are:

Local Education Agency (LEA) Applications - This review system consists of an internal process for evaluating local policies and procedures, the development of model policies and procedures for use by school districts, and training of school district representatives in a process for developing local policies and procedures. All special education service units submitted their revised policies and procedures for approval by August 1, 1990. Thereafter, only revisions are required to be submitted on an annual basis for approval.

Complaint Investigation - This system consists of formal procedures for receiving, investigating and resolving written complaints which allege a violation of any state or federal law or regulation governing the provision of FAPE to a child with a disability.

Due Process - This system consists of due process hearings and is viewed as the primary means of ensuring the due process safeguards guaranteed by state and federal law.

Compliance Reviews - This system consists of two types of review, Focused and Comprehensive Compliance Reviews. Focused reviews are monitoring investigations conducted in response to data, information or actions that indicate probable noncompliance. These investigations are not cyclical but occur as needed. Comprehensive reviews are monitoring visits designed to examine compliance with all applicable state and federal requirements. These reviews are conducted on a periodic, cyclical (six year) basis. Comprehensive reviews consist of both on-site and pre-site procedures. Pre-site investigation procedures include a review of the compliance data bank, data analysis, review of documents and parent surveys. Procedures for on-site investigation include student file reviews, staff interviews and the use of peer monitors.

Technical assistance is provided as a part of the compliance review process in the following ways: 1) prior to being monitored, districts are given the opportunity to have representatives from their staff trained as peer monitors; and 2) following a monitoring visit, districts are provided technical assistance in completing their corrective actions.

INDIANA

Indiana State Department of Education
Division of Special Education
Room 229 State House
Indianapolis IN 46060

Telephone:	(317) 232-0570
Fax:	(317) 232-0589
E-Mail:	robert_marra@inspeced.ccmail.compuserve.com
SEA Web:	http://baby.indstate.edu/iseas/

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Sue Miner
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA)

Summary: We are in the early stages of developing an electronic educational record for the state in conjunction with our computerized child count system. This electronic record will be reviewed as the student record review portion of the monitoring. Additionally, we are in the beginning stages of working with the Performance Based Accreditation personnel to attempt to merge these into one process in Indiana.

IOWA

Iowa State Department of Education
Bureau of Special Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines IA 50319

Telephone:	(515) 281-3954
Fax:	(515) 242-6019
E-Mail:	sschmit@max.state.ia.us
SEA Web Address:	http://www.state.ia.us/educate/
SpecialNet:	IOWASE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Sandy Schmitz
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Iowa State Department of Education

Summary: The key elements of the Iowa compliance monitoring process are:

Pre-visit activities: - Review of Area Education Agency (AEA) plan, certification check, due process check, finance check, identification of certain populations (i.e., newly identified, out-of-state placements, adjusted program reports, related services recipients), conduct interviews with AEA compliance representative and/or AEA Director;

On-site activities: - Record reviews, personnel interviews, checks on policies and procedures, visits to classrooms, writing daily reports, exit briefing, parent interviews; and

Post-visit activities: - Preparation of final report, enter monitoring timelines on data base, follow-up activities. Instructional, support and administrative Bureau staff are included on each team. All Bureau staff members participate in compliance activities. There is a designated leader for each compliance visit and a coordinator for each daily visit. However, all members share responsibilities.

The final report includes strengths, concerns (non-compliance issues) and citations. The report contains a recommendation for each concern and a corrective action plan with a date in which each is to be completed and submitted to the ISDE. Each AEA receives a one day visit the fiscal year following their on-site visit to verify their completion of corrective action plans. Computers are used for word processing and data retrieval for monitoring.

KANSAS

Kansas State Board of Education
Student Support Services
120 SE 10th Avenue
Topeka KS 66612-1182

Telephone:	(785) 296-3868
Fax:	(785) 296-1413
E-Mail:	ngray@smtpgw.ksbe.state.ks.us
SEA Web Address:	http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Nancy Gray
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Kansas Department of Health & Environment

Summary: Kansas is currently changing some of its monitoring process to include different models with the same student outcomes for improved learning of all students. Below are the three different models that will be used in 1997-1998 school year.

1. Current School Improvement Process

   Visits are scheduled on a five year cycle, with dates approved by the State Education Agency (SEA) and the Local Education Agency (LEA) six months before the visits. The SEA facilitator arranges for a team of peers to assist with the visit. Before going on an on-site, formal complaints, due process hearings, parent calls, personnel reports, federally funded projects, and current Management Information Systems data have been checked by

the facilitator. A parent survey is mailed to parents early to allow for results to be compiled before the visit. Input from LEA administrators is also collected and compiled before the visit.

An On-site School Improvement Review includes the following activities:

* entry session with the special education administrator and other LEA staff at the discretion of the administrator;
* review of any documentation available in administrative files;
* review of a random sample of complete student files;
* visits to schools to observe and talk with general and special education staff;
* findings are entered into a computer program containing the requirements referenced back to State and Federal regulations. The report developed at the end of the visit and the corrective actions report later developed are produced as a part of the program; and
* an exit session with LEA staff, superintendents, and local boards is held to present a general overview of the findings.

A draft copy of the on-site report is sent to the LEA administrator six weeks after completion of the review. The draft report is considered final within four weeks of receipt unless it is appealed by the LEA. When the final report is forwarded to the LEA, the SEA facilitator provides technical assistance to remediate any deficiencies. The SEA issues systemic citations requiring technical assistance and staff development for corrective actions. Failure to complete corrective action(s) within the timelines may result in withholding State and Federal special education funds.

2. Five Year Continuous Improvement Process

In Kansas, the compliance monitoring/school improvement system guides districts and others through a regulatory procedure in which files are reviewed and decisions are made on the findings. The Five Year Continuous Improvement Plan, moves compliance monitoring from once every five years to a continuous process. Components of the Five Year Continuous Process include:

* LEA Application
* Community/Parent Involvement
* Self-Assessment
* Focus Area Reviews
* Review of Administrative and Student Files
* Analysis of Findings
* Staff Development
* Data Collection
* Resource Package to Assist LEAs
* Local Team Reviews

This new process begins this year, with pilot SEAs who completed an on-site visit last year. LEAs will work with the SEA in deciding what to target and review, timelines for the proposed activities, and how to develop their plan. It will be a continuous improvement process with technical assistance from the SEA.

3. The Integrated Review Process (IRP)

The IRP includes all federal and state programs and focuses on systemic change for all students. Integration of resources to address the needs of all students is essential to the process. This integrated approach helps link federal reform efforts directly to state reform efforts to improve the performance of all students.

The Integrated Program Review Process will:

- examine the educational curriculum and services provided all students, including students served with federal funds;
- assist individual schools or LEAs in using federal funds to meet the needs of the target populations;
- assess the extent to which the state's high standards and programs are effective and assist students to achieve;
- identify institutional barriers;
- monitor for program compliance; and
- provide ongoing technical assistance to individual schools or LEAs.

This new process replaces several program specific reviews that have been conducted previously. It will be conducted primarily on-site, by members from several program areas, who will examine and document how the integration of state and federal resources is helping to meet the educational needs of all students.

KENTUCKY

Kentucky State Department of Education
Division of Exceptional Children Services
Capitol Plaza Tower - 8th Floor
500 Mero Street
Frankfort KY 40601

Telephone: (502) 564-4970
Fax: (502) 564-6771
E-Mail: bkibler@kde.state.ky.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Barb Kibler
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Cabinet for Health Services

Summary: As part of the monitoring teams that do on-site monitoring, the Department uses staff from the local special education cooperatives and members of faculties from Departments of Education of the state colleges and universities.

Some technical assistance is given informally during the on-site monitoring. After the monitoring, technical assistance is provided to the districts in order to correct any areas of concern that have been identified.

General overview of monitoring procedure: Each district goes through a year of focused self-study. In the next year a two day on-site visit is conducted by a team of 7-10 monitors. A percentage of students' records are reviewed and interviews of special and regular education teachers, principals, and the Director of Special Education are conducted. Classroom observations of special and regular education teachers are made. Telephone interviews of parents are conducted by an independent agency. These responses are included in the report.

A report on the findings is sent to the district. Staff is available to help the district draft a corrective action plan. Once this plan is approved the district has 12 months to correct the areas of concern.

LOUISIANA

Louisiana State Department of Education
Office of Special Educational Services
P O Box 94064
Baton Rouge LA 70804-9064

Telephone: (504) 342-3661
Fax: (504) 342-3281
E-Mail: EDUNLAP@MAIL.STATE.LA.US
SEA Web Address: http://www.doe.state.la.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Ellen Dunlap Spears
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Bureau of Interagency Coordination

Summary: The goal of the monitoring process is to ensure that public education agencies operate special education programs and services for exceptional students in a manner consistent with the laws, regulations and standards governing the provision of a free, appropriate public education. Embodied in this process are proactive measures of self-evaluation and technical assistance.

The monitoring process includes the following components:

1. Self-Study - Through the process of self-study the school system assesses its degree of compliance with federal and state regulations which govern special education programs and services. School systems may also evaluate the quality of their programming and service delivery system by completing the quality indicators component of the self-study process.
2. Validation and Target Monitoring - Validation is a review for the purpose of confirming the results of the self-study. Target monitoring will focus on specific areas of concern revealed by:
   a. self-study data review;
   b. repeated compliance deficiencies;
   c. complaints filed with the Office of Special Educational Services (OSES), Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and others; and
   d. data submitted to the SDE, e.g., LANSER, Annual School Reports (ASR), Local Education Agency (LEA) applications.
3. Technical Assistance/Compliance Review - The SDE will provide technical assistance to public and participating nonpublic education agencies to ensure compliance with corrective action plans and to enhance program quality.

Agencies Monitored:

Local Education Agencies
Special School District #1
State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Schools
Participating Public and Nonpublic Agencies with Special Education Programs

Monitoring Participants:

The SDE validation process includes the assistance of local education agency special education personnel, special education university personnel and OSES personnel. The team leader is always an SDE/OSES employee and the SDE regional coordinators have been serving as team leaders.

Procedural Review/Revision of Monitoring Process:

The Office of Special Educational Services is in the process of reviewing and possibly revising its monitoring procedures. During the 1997-98 school year, the On-site Validation and Target Monitoring will be conducted only on an as-needed basis. This will enable staff to review the procedures, instruments and focus of the entire process. The goal of this internal review is to yield a process more attuned to student outcomes and instructional quality.

MAINE

Maine State Department of Education
Division of Special Services
23 State House Station
Augusta ME 04333

Telephone:	(207) 287-5950
Fax:	(207) 287-5900
E-Mail:	ethel.macklin@state.me.us
SEA Web Address:	http://www.state.me.us
SpecialNet:	MAINESE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Ethel Macklin
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Child Development Services

Summary: The Special Education Program Review Team in the Department of Education is responsible for the monitoring of special education programs. The Special Education Program Review Model has undergone revisions this past year. These changes are effective in the fall of 1997. The revised model is a three year process. The cycle is repeated every five years. In order to meet the challenges of providing excellence and equity to all students, increased collaboration between school units and the Department of Education will be a priority. While monitoring of the regulatory requirements continues to be an integral part of the review process, the changes in this model represent the transition from a system focused on procedural compliance to a system that also focuses on individual and systemic accountability.

Staff in the Special Education Program Review Unit consists of the Coordinator and three Distinguished Educators. The Distinguished Educators are professionals from the field whose contracts have been "purchased" by the Department of Education. The current staff consists of two local directors of special services and one behavioral consultant.

Year one of the review model will consist of a collaborative assessment of the school unit's programs and services. A team of professionals conducts an on-site visit. The team consists of the team leader from the Department and one or more professionals from the field. Approximately 150 professionals volunteer to serve on teams annually. On-site visits include interviews, student record audits, and parent questionnaires. A workshop (addressing the needs of the individual school unit) will be conducted for the school staff.

Department personnel will provide a "School Unit Snapshot" to the staff. This snapshot will be a comprehensive overview of data collected. It will include data in the area of special education, and in other areas such as Improving America's School Act Plan, Goals 2000 grants, and the Maine Educational Assessment report. School units will be encouraged to take a hard

look at the data, and to use this data (and additional data generated by the individual school) to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs and services.

The purpose of the year one on-site visit is to establish baseline data and to determine the current status of school unit programs and services. A Letter will address any necessary school unit needs/changes and any school initiated goals and program improvements. Department personnel will provide support and assistance to the school unit in order to correct deficiencies and to address areas of identified concerns.

Year two consists of the on-site regulatory compliance review. The review involves record audits and interviews. Deficient areas identified in year one will be monitored. An updated School Unit Snapshot will be presented. Progress on the school unit's identified goals and program improvements will be documented. A Letter of Findings will be provided and corrective action plan negotiated. Year three consists of a follow-up visit to verify that the corrective action plan is implemented.

MARYLAND

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore MD 21201

Telephone: (410) 767-0255
Fax: (410) 333-8165
E-Mail: ewulkan@msde.state.md.us
SpecialNet: MARYLANDDSE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Edward Wulkan
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Maryland State Department of Education

Summary: The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education (DSE), conducts audits periodically to ensure that public agencies providing special education and related services to students with disabilities are in compliance with federal and state special education regulations. The findings are identified as particular areas in which local written procedures approved by MSDE are not being implemented in accordance with the regulations.

Monitoring Procedures: Public agencies complete a self-evaluation by reviewing a sample of their special education student records for compliance with federal and state requirements. These findings are used by the public agency for monitoring their delivery and documentation of special education services.

MSDE conducts a site visit to public agencies every three years or more often if required. The monitoring teams are comprised of MSDE/DSE staff. Contractual staff may be utilized if the individual monitoring purpose requires impartial personnel. The schools visited and students records reviewed are randomly selected and are representative of Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, High Schools, and Special Centers. At the public agency's central office, records are reviewed for students placed in alternative educational settings, in private day and residential placements, and for students who receive their educational program at home or another alternative placement. Focused monitoring is used to investigate individual complaints

received by MSDE, and to provide sample information for specific monitoring concerns. Information is also collected from interviews with public school personnel which includes: Building Administrators; Admissions, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Chairpersons; Teachers; Related Service providers; and staff from the Central Special Education Office. Additionally, an Administrative Review of the public agencies special education procedures is completed. This includes policies and procedures which are reviewed but typically not found in individual student records. December 1 data submitted to MSDE through the Special Services Information System (SSIS) is reviewed to ensure the validity of the information.

The monitoring process is collaborative and is built on the premise of providing technical assistance throughout the monitoring process. Regional Administrators provide technical assistance to the public agencies during: the administrative review, the review of monitoring findings with the public agencies and the corrective actions process prior to follow-up monitoring. Additional technical assistance is provided as needed to investigate complaints and provide guidance and collaboration with the public agencies who are instituting systemic changes to their educational delivery system for special education.

MSDE does not foresee major changes in the current monitoring process. However, all forms and standards will have to be reviewed and revised to meet requirements of IDEA '97 as appropriate. Additionally, MSDE's forms including the Administrative Review and individual student record review forms will be revised to provide a clearer description of acceptable standards for compliance.

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts State Department of Education
Program Quality Assurance Services
350 Main Street
Malden MA 02148

Telephone:	(617) 388-3300 Ext. 424
Fax:	(617) 388-3476
E-Mail:	jstager@doe.mass.edu
SEA Web Address:	http://www.info.doe.mass.ed

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** John D. Stager
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Public Health

Summary: The Massachusetts Coordinated Program Review System addresses selected monitoring requirements for Special Education IDEA and state Ch. 766, Transitional Bilingual Education (Ch. 71A), Title I, and Civil Rights Methods of Administration-MOA (Title VI, Title IX and Section 504). Other required monitoring activities such as Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Ch. 74/Perkins Vocational Act, and Nutrition may be conducted during these coordinated reviews. For the 1997-98 school year, the Department is incorporating general administrative requirements for certain federally-funded grant programs in some district reviews. Selected school districts are notified in August of scheduled visits. District visits occur from October through May.

Coordinated Program Review Elements:

Team: Depending upon the size of a district and the number of program areas to be reviewed, a team of 3-8 Department staff conduct a coordinated program review of 4-5 days to a school district.

Scope: Approximately Fifty (50) districts are visited each year over a 7-year cycle.

Content: Program Review criteria encompass required elements for the specific program areas. For special education, elements selected for FY98 reviews contain, at a minimum, those required by the federal Office for Special Education Programs (OSEP) as a result of that agency's recent state review. In addition, elements selected for all areas are those that are most closely aligned with the goals of the Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993.

Report: A Coordinated Program Review Report is based on a review of written documentation regarding the operation of the district's programs, together with information gathered from the following methods:

- Interviews of administrative staff;
- Interviews of teaching and support services staff across all levels;
- Parent Advisory Council (PAC) Representatives and public interviews (upon public request);
- Student Record Reviews (Special Education, TBE, and Perkins Vocational Programs only): A sample of student records is selected by the Department. Student records are examined first by local staff and then verified by the on-site team using standard Department student record review procedures to make determinations regarding implementation of procedural and programmatic requirements. Parents of students with special needs are provided with an opportunity to complete a written questionnaire; and
- Classroom and Facilities Observation: A sample of instructional classrooms and school facilities is visited to determine general levels of compliance with program requirements.

Response: Findings for each programmatic area describe the implementation status of each criterion reviewed. Findings also note those criteria whose implementation the Team found to be commendable. For criteria found to be either "partially implemented" or "not implemented," the District proposes actions to bring those areas into compliance. Districts are encouraged to incorporate the corrective action activities into their District and School Improvement Plans, including the District Professional Development Plan.

The Department believes that this program review process is a positive experience for school districts and that the Final Report is seen as a helpful planning document for the school district. The Coordinated Program Review Report addresses findings for the nine components listed below in each regulated area reviewed.

Coordinated Program Review Components:

Assessment of Student Progress
Has the district implemented an assessment system that uses appropriate instruments, is conducted according to the specified timelines and covers the appropriate content areas to determine instructional needs of students?

Student Identification and Program Placement
Has the district followed procedures for student identification and placement into the program according to the criteria specified in regulations?

Parent and Community Involvement
Has the district ensured that parents are notified, in the appropriate language, and are involved in decisions regarding their children's programs and services?

Curriculum and Instruction
Does the district hold all students to high expectations and standards and ensure that programs are designed to maximize student performance within regular education and are implemented according to specific regulatory requirements with respect to class size, staffing ratio, and age spans? Has the district provided for coordination across program areas?

Student Support Services
Has the district ensured that all students have equal opportunity and access to programs or services?

Faculty, Staff and Administration
Does the district maintain certified staff in the specific program areas, provide supervision of aides and tutors, and provide ongoing professional development?

School Facilities
Does the district maintain facilities that are conducive to learning, facilitate integration, and provide equal access and opportunity for students to achieve?

Program Plan and Evaluation
Does the district have written program plans that are evaluated according to specific regulatory requirements? Do parents have opportunities for input on needs, program implementation, evaluation and improvement?

Record Keeping
Does the district maintain required records and documentation for each specific program area?

MICHIGAN

Michigan Department of Education
Field Services - Office of Special Education Service
P O Box 30008
Lansing MI 48909-7508

Telephone: (517) 373-7169
Fax: (517) 373-7504
Email: hreid@special.mde.state.mi.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Hugh Reid
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Office of Special Education and Early Childhood

Summary: The state is composed of fifty-seven (57) intermediate school districts (ISDs) which employ a professional responsible for the monitoring process. The professional staff person monitors each of the constituent local education agencies (LEAs) on a yearly basis. The state agency conducts monitoring on a three year cycle of all ISDs and their constituent LEAs, in addition to special education programs operated by the State Departments of Education, Social Services, Corrections and Mental Health.

The state monitoring review team includes a lead monitor from the Office of Special Education Services, Field Services Program and may consist of other professionals from the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Special Education (MDE-OSES), and ISD monitors from different ISDs than the one being monitored. The monitoring review teams vary in size dependent upon multiple variables including geographic area, population size, and complexity of the ISD.

Monitoring consists of policy and procedures review, and forms review completed prior to the on-site monitoring visit. A program/service review is conducted at the ISD and at each of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

constituent LEAs. The state monitor conducts a file validation of the two years that the SEA did not monitor the ISD. A personnel monitoring of professional credentials is also conducted.

The MDE-OSES on-site monitoring visits result in a monitoring report containing citations and corrective actions for both individual and system problem solving areas. The report, generated with a computer program version of the Michigan Monitoring System (MMS), yields a profile showing areas of compliance and areas in which new procedures, staff development, or other methods of improvement may be required to achieve compliance. All on-site visits are co-monitored with a member of the ISD and/or LEA present at each monitoring visit.

Michigan has developed standards based on the Michigan Special Education Administrative Rules for Special Education. These standards are based on criteria which must be documented for compliance. The special education policy and procedures review contains some areas which may be indicative of quality of education, which include curriculum for special education and professional development activities.

MINNESOTA

Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning
Division of Monitoring and Compliance
550 Cedar Street, Room 528
St. Paul MN 55101-2233

Telephone: (612) 297-2843
Fax: (612) 296-3272

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Tom Lombard
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Division of Monitoring and Compliance

Summary: The monitoring of programs for compliance in Minnesota has been established to primarily accomplish a two-fold purpose. First, monitoring occurs to determine the LEA's compliance with state and federal laws, rules and regulations. Second, monitoring provides LEAs with feedback on several aspects of program quality. As state and local personnel work together, a "customer friendly" system is evolving to meet the needs of stakeholders. Interdependence becomes the hallmark of the monitoring process. Creative solutions which are mutually beneficial and mutually satisfying lead to a Win/Win scenario in which cooperation precedes commitment which is necessary to achieve a well-crafted Corrective Action Plan.

The Division of Monitoring and Compliance (DMC) is particularly proud of the peer monitoring project which has been established in Minnesota. This project, made up of educational professionals from institutions of higher learning and local education agencies, is an integral part of the monitoring process. Training provided by DMC staff provides a foundation to participants in the areas of monitoring procedures, state expectations for team involvement, data privacy, orientation and exit meetings, use of self-study information, and analyzing information obtained during a monitoring visit. Our 129 peer monitors help to solidify the cooperation and team spirit which is characteristic of a successful monitoring visit.

Focused/targeted monitoring is utilized by DMC on a limited basis. Specifically, a focused/targeted monitoring is initiated when there are a significant number of citations in the

areas of eligibility and/or fiscal resources which surface during either a full compliance or a follow-up visit.

In conclusion, we believe the Minnesota monitoring system has established a customer friendly, educationally relevant approach that assures compliance and encourages continued quality services.

MISSISSIPPI

Mississippi State Department of Education
Office of Special Education
P O Box 771
Jackson MS 39205-0771

Telephone: (601) 359-3498
Fax: (601) 359-2198
E-Mail: lsmith@mdek12.state.ms.us
SEA Web Address: http://mdek12.state.ms.us/ods/sped.htm

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Loretta Smith
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health

Summary: One-fifth of the LEAs are monitored each year. Records such as teacher narratives, evaluation reports, forms utilized by the district, timelines, state and federal data, project applications, teacher units, teacher-by-teacher lists to verify Dec. 1 Child Count and teacher unit allocation, are reviewed prior to the site visit in the LEA. Problems or questions are followed up while in the LEA. Technical assistance is provided to appropriate personnel, if needed. Superintendents, program supervisors, parents, principals, and regular education and special education teachers are interviewed. Each site and classroom where a special education program is located is visited. Exit interviews are held with the program supervisor and superintendent and other personnel the LEA asks to attend. A draft report, which becomes the final report if issue is not taken by the LEA, is mailed to the LEA by Day 20 after the first day of the site visit. SDE must receive documentation that the LEA has begun implementation of the corrective action plan by Day 60 from the first day of the site visit. Corrective action plans must be completed by Day 180 from the first day of the site visit.

Responses to Selected Items:

#11 Data reviewed prior to entering the district serves as a basis for focus monitoring. Any problems noted are followed up while in the district.

#13 Monitoring of special education programs is a part of the Office of Accreditation monitoring procedures; however, Accreditation monitors do not always accompany us at the time of our on-site visit.

#16 Student programs are reviewed for educational benefit to ensure appropriate services are provided.

#17 MDE monitors provide technical assistance to teachers, related service providers, principals and others when problems are found on site visits.

#40 Changes are pending due to development of a statewide data system for special education.

MISSOURI

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Division of Special Education
School Improvement Section
P O Box 480
Jefferson City MO 65102

Telephone:	(573) 751-4909
Fax:	(573) 526-4404
E-Mail:	pwilliam@mail.dese.state.mo.us
SEA Web Address:	http://services.dese.state.mo.us
SpecialNet:	MO.SE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Pam Williams
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Ed Early Childhood Special Education Section

Summary: At the State Department of Education, the Section of Special Education School Improvement is responsible for monitoring Part B provisions of IDEA. The process for monitoring local districts includes the following components: Desk Audit (child count, census, fall enrollment data, LEA compliance plan, teachers, service delivery systems, local program evaluation, policies, forms, and pupil service problems); On-site Review (comprehensive review to include special education administration, case record review, and service delivery); Participation in Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Review (special education monitors assist in the review of the total school program by assessing the local district program and the extent to which the Missouri School Improvement Standards are implemented within that district). The following are procedures for the program review and occur in this order: initial contact with LEA; contact MSIP team leader; conduct program review; MSIP review; program review report; review report and corrective action plan acceptance; conduct follow-up review.

Comments on specific survey questions:

11. One fifth of the districts in Missouri are monitored each year. Monitoring is "customized" with all districts being monitored on a set of selected components and with individual districts being monitored on other selected components based upon the results of the district's desk review and program profile. The "core items" on which all districts are monitored are selected from year to year and are based upon information gathered from pervious monitoring, child complaints, due process filings, and various other sources.

13. In Missouri all monitoring (State and Federal) of LEAs is done as a part of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). MSIP is a comprehensive school improvement process which incorporates the following components: Resource, Process, Performance, and District Self-study.

16. In the past our monitoring has been centered around strictly compliance issues and minimal compliance for the specific procedure. We are, however, moving toward more in-

depth monitoring of a selected group of standards that address issues related to student results/outcomes. This new direction in our monitoring process was implemented last year and is continuing this year. Our decision for the "customized" review is based on this "results oriented" process.

MONTANA

Montana Office of Public Instruction
Division of Special Education
P O Box 202501
Helena MT 59620-2501

Telephone: (406) 444-5661
Fax: (406) 444-3924
E-Mail: Spaulson@opi.mt.gov
Brunkel@opi.mt.gov

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Sue Paulson and Bob Runkel
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Public Health and Human Services

Summary: The Division of Special Education, Office of Public Instruction, employs an ongoing and systematic process to ensure compliance with all applicable statutes and regulations.

The process includes on-site visitations, document review at the SEA level (analysis of the district's program narrative) and the provision of technical assistance to public agencies. Approximately one-fifth of all special education programs and cooperatives are visited on-site annually in a five-year cycle. In addition, all state-operated programs are monitored on-site at least every three years.

On-site monitoring activities include interviews, a complete record review of a sampling of student files, parent surveys, and a review of the district's program narrative and child count. After the on-site review, a written report is sent to the district which identifies corrective actions, if any, and offers technical assistance. The district must respond in writing to corrective actions. Further documentation and verification of compliance may be required if the written response is not adequate. A follow-up on-site review is scheduled when the response and documentation to a corrective action do not ensure compliance.

Computers are used during on-site monitoring and in the completion of reports.

NEBRASKA

Nebraska State Department of Education
Special Populations
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln NE 68509

Telephone: (402) 471-2471
Fax: (402) 471-0117

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Beth Wierda

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services

Summary: The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) Special Education Office Standards Review Procedures are ongoing and consist of annual reviews and a five-step focusing process. The process permits school districts and NDE to meet both state and federal standards and allows school districts the opportunity for NDE assistance in the development of school district innovative programs. NDE staff annually review special education plans and budgets, final financial reports, transportation applications and claims, updated special education policies and procedures, staff caseloads and variance requests, staff endorsements and licenses, program expansion requests and child count information.

The five-year proactive plan for school district accountability for special education programs begins with the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), a written agreement between NDE and the district. The MOU includes a system of self-evaluation, the availability of technical assistance, and a commitment by NDE and the district to develop a plan for program improvement. The MOU is a road map to guide systemic improvement and staff development and becomes the outline of school district/NDE proposed activities during the five-year process. If a district chooses to conduct a self-study review, the process may be included in the MOU.

Year 1 The MOU is developed

During the first year of the program standards review (PSR) process an initial MOU is developed. The MOU is a fluid document and is modified throughout the five year focusing process.

Year 2 MOU Focusing Process

During the second year of the process, NDE collects and reviews specific district information to individualize the review. The following information is reviewed:

1. District Policies/Procedures. If a school district is unable to clarify either through documentation or interview how a particular standard is implemented, that standard will be included in the MOU and reviewed during the on-site visit.
2. Student Information System Data (SESIS).
3. Forms Review
4. Review previous Letters of Findings. Standards which are identified as having an implementation rate of less than 80% are included within the MOU.
5. Complains and Appeals. NDE reviews complaints and appeals which have been filed against the district within the last five years. Standards which are identified as deficient by a hearing officer or complaint investigator are included in the MOU.

Year 3 Focused Technical Assistance

During Year 3 of the review process, focused technical assistance is made available to the district. The MOU is updated to include documentation of the technical assistance made available to the district.

Year 4 Finalization of the MOU and Onsite Visit

During the fourth year of the review process, the MOU is finalized and the on-site visit conducted. The finalization of the MOU includes;

1. Date(s) of the on-site visit.
2. Participants in the review. Participants may include NDE staff, other professionals and parents.
3. Standards to be reviewed. The standards which have been identified through the focusing process conducted during Years 1-3.
4. Statewide Standards. In addition to the standards identified through the focusing process, additional statewide standards are included based on the following:
   A. change in federal regulations;
   B. change in state regulation;
   C. statewide issues and concerns; and
   D. federal requirements pursuant to OSEP on-site visits.
5. Number of Files to be Reviewed.
6. A final MOU is prepared and provided to the district for signature.

The on-site review includes the following:

1. If a sample review demonstrates less than 80% implementation on any standard, the implementation of that standard will be determined deficient.
2. Within 45 calendar days of the review, the NDE Special Education Office shares a written draft of the review findings. If additional data collection is required, the additional data are amended.
5. Within 60 calendar days of completion of the file review, the NDE submits the final report notifying the school district of its status.
6. School districts are afforded 45 calendar days to respond to the final report with a plan for resolution of the deficiency(ies) or documentation of resolution. The plan for resolution must include the specific action(s) the district will take and a timeline it will follow to correct the deficiency(ies). TA is available from the NDE, on request, to develop the plan.
7. Within 30 calendar days, the NDE Special Education Office notifies the school district of the approval or disapproval of the plan for resolution.

Year 5 Follow Up

During the fifth year of the process, follow-up activities are conducted. The procedures for the follow-up activities are listed below.

1. Correction of deficiencies is reviewed by the NDE in accordance with the approved Plan for Resolution.
2. Within 45 calendar days of the review, the NDE notifies the school district of its status.
3. School districts failing to respond within 45 days of initial notification with a report or Plan of Resolution shall be afforded an additional 30 days following contact from the Administrator of the Special Education Office or designee to correct the deficiencies.
4. If deficiencies are not corrected, the school district is notified by certified mail that the NDE intends to report the violation to the State Board of Education. No state funds shall be paid to any school district as long as such violation exists.
5. Within 21 calendar days of the district's receipt of the notice of the special education Office's intention to recommend a penalty to the State Board of Education, the school district may request in writing a review by the Commissioner of designee.

6. Within 30 calendar days of receipt of a notice of the Commissioner's intent to recommend a penalty, the school district may request in writing a hearing before the State Board of Education.

School districts reporting no children with disabilities will be required to submit evidence of efforts to locate children with disabilities.

NEVADA

Nevada State Department of Education
Educational Equity Team
700 E. 5th Street - Suite 113
Carson City NV 89701-5096

Telephone: (702) 687-9143
Fax: (702) 687-9123
SpecialNet: NV.SE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Ann M. Alexander
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Nevada Department of Human Resources

Summary: The Nevada Department of Education, Special Education Branch, has implemented a three-phase cycle of program monitoring activities. The phases are:

1. Compliance Monitoring;
2. Self-monitoring; and
3. Program Effectiveness.

In any given year, one-third of Nevada's 17 LEAs are in each of the three phases, and districts complete all three phases during a three-year cycle. In Compliance Monitoring, the Department reviews the district's local plan and previous monitoring reports, procedures and policies, special education forms, and any available self-monitoring reports. Early in the spring, a seven-item survey is mailed to 10 percent of the district's special education parents. The Department then conducts on-site visits to selected schools in order to review student records and interview staff and parents. Monitoring teams include university faculty, peer LEA teachers and related service providers, and private consultants. Compliance judgments are made; site-level reports are finalized at the conclusion of each site-visit, an exit interview is conducted with the principal; and a district-level report summarizing site-level findings and outlining noncompliance areas is presented to district administrators at the conclusion of the visit. As corrective action plans are developed and implemented, technical assistance from the SEA is made available. During the self-monitoring year, districts may use a process of their own or the same forms/processes used by the SEA in compliance monitoring. A report of findings must be submitted to the SEA during June. For Program Effectiveness activities, districts utilize a stakeholder model to identify issues, review programs, design program improvement strategies, and implement the strategies. A report of Program Effectiveness activities must be submitted to the SEA during June.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire State Department of Education
Education Improvement
Quality Assurance Bureau
101 Pleasant Street
Concord NH 03109

Telephone: (603) 271-3842
Fax: (603) 271-1953
E-Mail: rkennedy@Ed.State.NH.US

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Robert Kennedy
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health

Summary: The mission of Special Education Services is to ensure that students with educational disabilities receive a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. The Bureau vigorously pursues this mission by, among other activities, assuring the implementation of state and federal laws and regulations governing students with educational disabilities.

The operational format for the Department's Special Education Services is characterized by an ongoing, open, and collaborative relationship between the department and its constituents. There are ample opportunities for Special Education Services and the educational community to explore possibilities for educational innovations and to work collaboratively and cooperatively to solve problems.

Special Education Services maintains regular contact with local school districts regarding the provision of special education services and the ongoing improvement of those services. The monitoring process results in an improved understanding of the services and programs delivered by local school districts, as well as the problems they experience. It provides the Department with adequate information upon which to base decisions concerning compliance. By organizing information and data in ways that are more useful to the state and LEAs, the Department strives for a reduction in the volume of paperwork processed. The goal is to establish a collaborative process through which the State and local districts work together in a cooperative spirit. Special Education Services provides training and assistance to local districts on the implementation of various components of the monitoring process.

This approach represents a major shift in thinking about the purpose of monitoring. It represents a new vision of monitoring as school improvement and not simply compliance.

The Department of Education's new approach to monitoring is an attempt to "look broadly at new ideas" to better serve its constituents. The shift in monitoring is a bold response to the needs of a society with new and ever changing needs. Components of this system include:

LEA applications
New Hampshire Special Education Information System (SPEDIS)
District self monitoring reports generated through SPEDIS
Student outcome data
Case studies
Self-monitoring
File reviews
Interviews
Consumer and constituent input

NEW JERSEY

New Jersey Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
P O Box 500
Trenton NJ 08625

Telephone: (609) 292-4692
Fax: (609) 292-5558 or (609) 984-8422

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Coordinator of Program Review (Vacant Position)
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health and Senior Services

Summary: Special Education Monitoring System - The program review (monitoring) system is a cumulative ongoing process developed to assist local education agencies (LEAs) and other provider agencies (PAs) in identifying areas of strength and need. Two additional components, vital to the purpose of the program review system, are accountability for pupils with disabilities and the provision of technical assistance and support to LEAs/PAs to meet the standards of program compliance.

Program review is a four-year cycle that is based on the collection, review and analysis of data from various sources. The process of program review begins with a self-study evaluation completed by each LEA/PA prior to an on-site visit. The data collected during these on-site visits are used to determine the following:

1. LEA/PA compliance with federal and state regulations;
2. areas of deficiency and need; and
3. program effectiveness.

Each LEA is monitored on the same compliance standards in the same year. For example, during year one, on-site program review visits are conducted in receiving schools. These include special education programs operated by agencies such as private schools and special services school districts. In addition, LEAs submit information such as required policies and procedures for review and approval. Annual corrective actions may be necessary to correct deficiencies found.

Technical assistance is provided at an individual district level and statewide training on a cyclical basis. Districts receive individual assistance in completing their self-study process and implementing their corrective action plans. Annually, statewide training is provided which specifically addresses the areas to be monitored in the subsequent year. For example, training was provided last spring regarding FAPE and the Utilization of Federal Funds, the areas identified for on-site monitoring during the 1997-98 school year.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico State Department of Education
Special Education Office
300 Don Gaspar
Santa Fe NM 87501

Telephone: (505) 827-6541
Fax: (505) 827-6791

45

Email: tpenn1@juno.com
SEA Web Address: http://sde.state.nm.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Patricia Penn
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** New Mexico Department of Health

Summary: The New Mexico State Department of Education's (NMSDE) accreditation review of the state's 89 local education agencies (LEAs), nine state supported educational programs (SSEPs) and yearly review of any private schools seeking accreditation, is an ongoing process that includes an on-site review every three years. The LEAs' policy and procedure manuals are formally reviewed in conjunction with the IDEA-B application approval process. However, this information is also included in the NMSDE Special Education Office's documentation review in preparation for those LEAs scheduled for an on-site visit.

Each NMSDE special education consultant is assigned an LEA and SSEP yearly for accreditation review. The on-site review process is a collaborative effort involving all offices within the NMSDE. The composition of each on-site team is determined by the individual needs of each LEA and SSEP. At least one special education consultant participates as a team member during each on-site review. The special education summary of the on-site visit is integrated within the compliance and program sections of the NMSDE Accreditation Review Report. Also, technical assistance is provided to LEAs during the on-site visits on an informal basis.

Areas of noncompliance noted as part of the on-site review are addressed through each LEA'S Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS). The EPSS is a long range plan LEAs are required to develop to address the educational needs of **all** students. As a result, during the next three year on-site review, each LEA will be reviewed for compliance in its implementation of its EPSS, as well as federal regulations and state standards.

NEW YORK

New York State Department of Education
Special Education Quality Assurance
55 Hanson Place - Room 545
Brooklyn NY 11217-1580

Telephone: (718) 722-4544
Fax: (718) 722-2032
E-Mail: Rcort@mail.nysed.gov
SEA Web Address: http://www.nysed.gov/
SpecialNet: NY.SA

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring**: Dr. Rebecca Cort
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health

Summary: The focus of New York State's special education Quality Assurance system is the improvement of both program effectiveness and student outcomes, while still addressing procedural compliance. Annual school district data reports, covering such areas as achievement, classification rate, placements in the least restrictive environment, diplomas awarded and drop-out data are the basis for determining the focus, intensity and comprehensiveness of each review.

50 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Our collaborative review teams include Department staff, parents, teachers, and administrators from both general and special education. Teams are provided intensive training by the Department prior to their review. The special education process is designed to occur over an entire school year, culminating in the development of a Quality Assurance and Improvement Plan (QAIP). This plan is to be implemented the following year and must address areas of weakness identified during the review in the area of student outcomes (i.e., levels of student achievement and integration). To assist the districts in carrying out both the collaborative review and the QAIP, IDEA discretionary funds are available based on the size of the district.

Although LEA peers are not currently used as part of the monitoring team, they do assist each fall in the team training process, and it is our intention to include them on the review teams in the future. Similarly, both IHE faculty and contracted personnel are being considered for future team participation. The degree of their participation will depend upon the district data related to student outcomes.

Our current cycle is seven years, but high performing districts take part in an abbreviated review, while the lowest performing districts are on a shorter cycle of focused reviews, and the reviews themselves are preceded by a period of intensive technical assistance.

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Exceptional Children Support Team
301 North Wilmington Street
Raleigh NC 27601

Telephone: (919) 715-1604
Fax: (919) 715-1569
SpecialNet: NC.SE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Dr. Mardie Meany
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Human Services

Summary: Monitoring is conducted by the Exceptional Children Support Team, Department of Public Instruction. Program Compliance Audit (PCA) is comprised of the following: pre-PCA visit (TA is primary thrust), desk-top (at SEA), on -site visit, development of corrective action plan/approval, development of fiscal corrective action plan/approval (if required), identification of audit exceptions and any subsequent allotment reductions. NC has changed its monitoring process in the past year to combine the headcount audit and the program compliance visit. Monitors now have the authority to require payback of state and federal dollars when specific compliance citations occur. Audit exceptions used to be under the umbrella of a different section of DPI. Explanations in greater detail are available if anyone is interested. However, the following notes explain some of the items in the matrix:

#22. Use of computer - Beginning in April, all head count data will be transmitted electronically - no more paper.
#23. Review of LEA application - Monitors review Part B plans, but actual review is completed by VI-B consultants at the time of submission.
#25. Review of interagency agreements - The interagency agreements are at a state level. We review contracts.

#29. Training manual for monitors - All training occurs through use of actual monitoring documents.
#32. LEA Policy & Procedure review form is used with review of VI-B plans.
#40. Changes were recently made.

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
Office of Special Education
600 East Boulevard
Bismarck ND 58505-0440

Telephone: (701) 328-2277
Fax: (701) 328-2461
E-Mail: jnewborg@c01as400.state.nd.us
SEA Web Address: http://www.sendit.nodak.edu/dpi/

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Jean Newborg
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** North Dakota Department of Human Services

Summary: Each of the state's special education units and school districts is monitored by the Department of Public Instruction, with approximately 20 percent visited each year. Monitoring activities include a review of each unit's IDEA-B three year plan, review of the policies and procedures manual, an on-site visit where student files are reviewed and interviews are conducted with staff, a mail survey of parents with telephone contact for selected parents, focus group with parents, a review of child count, and a review of fiscal records. Monitoring data are also used to identify and deliver needed technical assistance. A team consisting of four to six special education program staff are responsible for the monitoring activities. A monitoring report is prepared that gives the status of each regulation under IDEA (plus some FERPA regulations). The report includes a narrative of the regulations, findings and corrective actions. Timelines are established for completing corrective actions. The Department of Public Instruction has developed the means to compile, by regulation, the extensive data collected for each unit. A laptop computer is provided for each team member to record student file review data. A template of the monitoring report facilitates preparation and allows greater consistency.

Six to twelve months prior to on-site monitoring, the regional technical assistance person meets with school administrators and staff to review the monitoring process. A *premonitoring manual* has been developed to assist units and school districts to prepare for monitoring. Technical assistance is also provided as appropriate, to assist units to plan and implement their corrective action plans.

Staffing: No one person is assigned full time to monitoring. There are presently 6 regional special education coordinators (our director also has these duties), all of whom are SEA staff, who contribute some time to monitoring. A time study done during the last quarter of 1996 indicated that 18.8 percent of our time was devoted to monitoring.

Process and materials:

12. We are moving special education units to develop their own internal monitoring systems. One has done this, focusing on IEPs only to this point.

13. Not yet. However, special education is the only unit that monitors for FERPA regs.

15. We have included an "Other Concerns" section of the monitoring report to address quality issues, systemic problems, etc., that aren't technically compliance issues. Several of our unit directors just want us to report on IDEA violations and not include quality issues or best practices. We find they are sometimes confused about the difference and can't separate IDEA requirements from best practices.

18. We typically use mail surveys and invite comments. We have just been trained in conducting focus groups and expect to increase our use of this methodology.

19. We have look-up tables of basic information on school buildings, but do not pull in school improvement and other data — yet.

24. The three year plan submitted by each unit is required to include interagency agreements. The regional coordinators review all aspects of the three year plan when it is submitted. A unit will be asked to correct anything that is missing or insufficient.

26. Not consistently or all in one place. We do joint training and that increases our inter-rater reliability.

27. In small units, we generally visit all schools. In larger units, our selection depends on including children with various disabilities, whether we have gotten complaints about a building, when the last time was that the building was visited during monitoring, etc.

28. No; see #26.

29. We don't have a formula, as such. We have identified a number of factors to be considered and use those as guidelines (i.e., various disabilities, various ages, recently enrolled, enrolled more than 3 years, age 14 and older, age 18 and older, etc.)

38. Not extensively.

OHIO

Ohio Department of Education
Division of Special Education
933 High Street
Worthington OH 43085-4087

Telephone: (614) 466-2650
Fax: (614) 728-1097
SpecialNet: OHIODSE
Email: se_saylor@ode.ohio.gov
SEA Web Address: http://www.ode.ohio.gov/

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Dr. John Saylor
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Division of Early Childhood

Summary: Presently, under the restructuring of the Ohio Department of Education, the Division of Special Education has been assigned to the School Improvement Unit of the department. In keeping with the Mission of the School Improvement Unit, the Division has included in the Monitoring Procedures a system to assist LEAs improve their services to students with disabilities; therefore, exceeding minimum federal and state requirements.

Mission Statement: The School Improvement Reviews (SIRs) are used to ensure that every child with a disability is provided a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment in accordance with federal and state regulations and that educational programs in Ohio are of such quality that students are prepared to be contributing members of society.

The Monitoring process may include any one of the following:

Comprehensive Onsite Review — A review of all special education programs operated by the district, including interviews with parents, administrators, regular and special education teachers, and support personnel.

Selective Review — A review of an issue or specific area of a district's comprehensive program, based on data and information available at the Division of Special Education. The district may also request a selective review.

Follow-up Review — Visitation(s) to the school district to ascertain if the district has implemented the Plan of Action indicated in a previous report.

Monitoring of Special Education Federal Funds — An Onsite visitation to ensure federal funds are expended in accordance with federal law.

Target Review — Monitoring of experimental, innovative, or other programs which may be approved by the Division of Special Education as providing effective programs and positive outcomes for children with disabilities. (For example, transition services, interpreters, etc.)

School Improvement Review Activities may consist of:

Comprehensive Onsite Review — Focuses on the six (6) major areas of IDEA, such as least restrictive environment (LRE), individualized education program (IEP), Procedural Safeguards, multifactored evaluation (MFE), child identification, and free appropriate public education (FAPE). A review of all special education programs operated by the district including interviews with parents, administrators, regular and special education teachers and support personnel is conducted.

Management Assistance — This review includes an on-site visitation to examine current expenditures and practices with the intent to explore ways of improving services.

Selective Review — A review of specific issue(s) or concern(s) brought to the attention of the DOE. The review includes one or more components of the comprehensive review and is individually designed for each district. The purposes of the selective review are to determine compliance with federal and state law and to assist districts resolve specific issue(s) or concern(s). The district may also request a selective review.

Follow-up Review — Visitation(s) to the school district to ascertain if the district has implemented the Plan of Action indicated in a previous review.

Target Reviews — A review of a specific area such as transition services, interpreter services, or special education services to students in the least restrictive environment through

Alternative Service Delivery Options (ASDOs). Technical Assistance is also a component of this review.

Review of Special Education Programs
Districts selected for on-site are identified by coordinators and administrative staff based on administrative input (OCR findings, impartial hearings, administrative procedures, complaints, geographical location, demographic information, and review schedule).

Pre-Onsite Activities
Pre-Onsite meeting held at district two (2) to three (3) weeks prior to on-site review to discuss on-site procedures; review the on-site checklist (developed by SEA); discuss and identify program development component; review the on-site agenda (tentative agenda is developed and approved by Coordinator prior to the pre-on-site meeting). Agenda includes review of special education program and related services; and review of the implementation of procedures including Child Records, IEPs, actual implementation of Administrative Procedures, Parent Interviews, and LRE

Components of Onsite Review
Comprehensive Review of District Special Education Programs and Related Services

SEA staff review special education programs operated by the district, as well as related services provided by the district. Structured interviews with special educators, regular educators, parents, related services personnel, administration and all other school personnel involved with students with disabilities are conducted using a building/district structured interview guide.

Post-Onsite Activities
Individuals develop recommendations, commendations, program suggestions, and statements for further inquiry prior to the Plan of Action meeting.

Plan of Action Meeting
The Plan of Action Meeting is held with the LEA to review the fairness and accuracy of the report; discuss and agree upon a plan of corrective action for each area of school improvement (noncompliance issues, as well as program suggestions); resolve issues that were developed for further discussion, technical assistance, and follow through; and finalize strategies for program development/improvement and personnel to be involved, i.e. SERRC personnel, SEA.

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma State Department of Education
Special Education Section
2500 North Lincoln Blvd.
Oklahoma City OK 73105

Telephone:	(405) 521-3351
Fax:	(405) 521-6205
E-Mail:	dgriffin@mail.sde.state.ok.us
	bethpugh@mail.sde.state.ok.us
SEA Web Address:	http://sde:state.ok.us/
SpecialNet:	OK.SE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Beth Pugh and Darla Griffin
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Oklahoma State Department of Early Intervention

Summary: Preparation for Monitoring: Prior to the school year in which agencies are to be reviewed, personnel are notified by the local Regional Education Service Center (RESC) of in service training and technical assistance opportunities in preparation for monitoring by the State Department of Education (SDE).

Notification: The SDE conducts an annual compliance review of approximately one-fourth of the state's local education agencies. During September, selected agencies are notified by letter regarding specific procedures and the dates and times of scheduled compliance reviews. The Pre-site Monitoring Survey, Preparation for On-site, and Public Agency Monitoring Document (PAMD) are included in this notice with instructions for completion. A date of return is also specified. The SDE may, at any time, determine that an in-depth, focused, follow-up or self monitoring of the LEA is warranted because of complaints or concerns.

Pre-site: The Pre-site Monitoring Survey, Preparation for On-Site is completed by the LEA and returned to the SDE. It's purpose is to gather information concerning procedures, programming, personnel and finances which assists the team in determining compliance status and personalizing the on-site review.

Four monitoring review options are available to determine compliance in LEAs:

In-Depth Monitoring: A compliance team of SDE staff may include, but not be limited to, a Regional Accreditation Officer, a representative of the RESC, Special Education Services personnel and others determined to be appropriate by the SDE. On-site activities include:

1. Entry conference with the agency administrator.
2. Review of a sample of student records from buildings visited. A sample of inactive student records is also reviewed.
3. Review of administrative records for compliance with federal and state regulations.
4. IEP tracking: Team members track a selected sample of students to ensure the implementation of the IEP. Tracking may involve interviews, and classroom observations.
5. Building facilities observation: A review to determine if instructional space is comparable for students with disabilities, and if special education services provide integration with students without disabilities to the maximum extent appropriate.
6. Interviews: Interviews with selected persons (e.g., school personnel, parents) for the purpose of verifying procedures used within the agency, pre-site information, and implementation of state and federal requirements.
7. Pre-exit conference: Noncompliance areas are identified on an agency-wide basis and reported on the Compliance Report: Special Education Programs Monitoring.
8. Exit conference: Conducted with the LEA administrator or designee and other personnel at the discretion of the administrator. The administrator is informed of the team's findings and receives a draft copy of the Compliance Report.
9. The SDE completes a finalized report with required corrective actions for areas of deficiency and noncompliance. The SDE notifies the LEA by a conference call of results of the compliance review, including any corrective actions required. The finalized report is mailed to the LEA.

Focused Monitoring: On-site procedures for focused monitoring include:

1. Entry conference with the agency administrator.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Focused review of a sample of student records: The review focuses on identified areas of concern determined from pre-site documents and/or other areas.
3. IEP tracking and/or parent and teacher interviews. Team members track a sample of students whose records have been reviewed.
4. Pre-exit conference. Team members document sources of information for all areas reviewed. Noncompliance areas are identified on an agency-wide basis and reported.
5. Exit conference. Conducted with the LEA, agency administrator or designee and other personnel at the discretion of the administrator. The administrator is informed of the team's findings and receives a draft copy of the Compliance Report.
6. The SDE completes a finalized report with required corrective actions. The SDE notifies the LEA by conference call of the results of the review. The finalized report is mailed to the LEA.

Local Education Agency Self Monitoring: The SDE distributes self-monitoring forms and instructions to the LEA. Program areas and student records to be monitored are identified in the letter. Self-monitoring procedures include:

1. A representative from the RESC or other SDE personnel goes on-site to complete the Administrative Records Checklist. They verify various data and information (e.g., child count data, records to verify self-monitoring, etc.) Self-monitoring forms and documentation are collected from the LEA for further review by the SDE.
2. Further review by the SDE may include conference calls, requests for additional data, or on-site verification of information submitted.
3. The SDE notifies the LEA by a conference call of the results of the compliance review and issues a report, including any corrective actions required.

Follow-up Monitoring: On-site monitoring procedures include:

1. A review of implementation of corrective actions required by previous monitoring.
2. Verification that corrective actions have adequately addressed areas of deficiency.
3. Procedures may include review of records, on-site observations, interviews with school personnel and parents.
4. Pre-exit conference. Team members document sources of information relevant to the corrective actions reviewed. Compliance or noncompliance is identified and documented.
5. Exit conference. Conducted with the LEA, administrator or designee and other personnel at the discretion of the administrator. The administrator is informed of the team's findings and receives a draft copy of the follow-up Compliance Report.
6. The SDE completes a finalized report with required corrective actions. The SDE notifies the LEA by a conference call of the results of the review, including any corrective actions. The finalized report is mailed to the LEA.

OREGON

Oregon Department of Education
Office of Special Education
255 Capitol Street NE
Salem OR 97310-0203

Telephone:	(503) 378-3598, X-623
Fax:	(503) 373-7968
E-Mail:	linda.felber@state.or.us
SEA Web Address:	http://www.ode.state.or.us

SpecialNet: OREGONSE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Linda M. Felber
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Oregon DOE, Office of Special Education

Summary: Oregon Department of Education (ODE), Office of Special Education, is responsible for the monitoring of all agencies charged with providing a free and appropriate public education to exceptional students. A flowchart is available which shows how the system functions. On-site visits are conducted in conjunction with the Standards Division of the Oregon Department of Education. The program review process operates on a six year cycle which includes the on-site review, comprehensive application submission, regional workshops, and self-evaluation pilot project training and implementation.

Some data is gathered prior to going on-site via a desk audit. File reviews, case studies, and interviews with special education teachers, general education teachers, administrators, and parents comprise the on-site visits which are followed up with technical assistance and, if necessary, a corrective action plan. The corrective actions that districts and agencies are required to make are developed collaboratively with the Office of Special Education. In this way, the strengths and capabilities of the districts and agencies are used as the basis for the activities correcting compliance problems.

The Office of Special Education includes local agency representatives on the team which conducts the on-site review. This practice provides training for local education agency personnel and increases communication with department staff.

The monitoring system continues to adapt as Oregon implements education reform legislation. In addition, the Office of Special Education is developing a system which provides an electronic link between all monitoring activities, including the comprehensive application process and the annual application. This structure will provide for increased efficiency and will improve data analysis.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania State Department of Education
Bureau of Special Education
Division of Compliance
333 Market Street, 7th Floor
Harrisburg PA 17126-0333

Telephone: (717) 783-6135
Fax: (717) 783-6139

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Jill Lichty
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare

Summary: The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) has responsibility to ensure that all school districts in the Commonwealth are in compliance with applicable state and federal laws, regulations, and standards, and provide a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for all exceptional students for whom they are legally responsible. To fulfill this responsibility, the PDE has established administrative procedures which provide ongoing monitoring of program implementation, including evaluation of the appropriateness, effectiveness, and

accountability of special education services and programs provided by school districts. These administrative procedures include monitoring, ensuring the provision of appropriate programs, corrective action, technical assistance and in-service training programs.

Overview: The goal of the monitoring system is to ensure that Local Education Agencies (LEAs) operate special education services and programs for school aged exceptional students in a manner consistent with the regulations and standards governing the provision of FAPE. The system, while continuing to insist on adherence to the provisions of Chapters 14 and 342 of State Special Education Regulations, also serves as a support system to school districts.

Monitoring includes the following components:

Target Monitoring: Target monitoring involves focused compliance reviews conducted as a result of any of the following:

- A review of LEA or interagency agreement file data (e.g., PennData statistical summaries, district special education plans, district/agency policies and procedures, etc.)
- An allegation of a systemic violation, Bureau Director's order, complaints filed with the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), etc.
- Statewide priority issues as determined by the Bureau Director (e.g., over identification of eligible students, least restrictive environment, multidisciplinary evaluation process, IEP development, facilities, and placement in approved private schools)
- Repeated compliance deficiencies in an LEA

Cyclical monitoring: LEAs are selected at random for monitoring. Monitoring activities include but are not limited to a review of critical student-centered documents, classroom observations and interviews with parents and LEA personnel.

Technical assistance: BSE provides technical support to LEAs to ensure compliance with Chapters 14 and 342, to enhance program quality, or as part of an LEA-developed corrective action plan. Technical assistance may be provided by BSE teams, or regional instructional support center personnel.

Monitoring Teams: Monitoring is conducted by teams chaired by BSE staff. To assist in on-site review, the BSE recruits local educators with acknowledged expertise in special education, and parents of exceptional students who have been trained in the compliance monitoring system.

PUERTO RICO

Department of Education
Government of Puerto Rico
P. O. Box 190759
Hato Rey, PR 00919-0759

Telephone: 787-754-8903
Fax: 787-753-0015

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Maria A. Palacios
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Health Department

Summary: The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) is a unitary agency. The structure of the State Education Agency (SEA) differs from most other SEAs in that the educational regions and school districts are all components of the PRDE. They are not separate local education agencies or sub-grantees. PRDE is organized in seven educational regions. Each of the seven regions is administered by a regional director who reports directly to the Secretary of Education. Each region has at least three general supervisors of special education who report to the regional director and are responsible for the supervision of special education services in the region.

Each of the seven educational regions is divided into 13-16 school districts. Puerto Rico has a total of 100 school districts. School districts have a zone supervisor of special education, who reports to the school district superintendent and who coordinates the special education program within the district. All special education teachers report to the school principal, and the school principal as well as the related services personnel assigned to a school district, report directly to the superintendent of schools. The Secretary of Education is the official ultimately responsible for education programs for children with disabilities and also has the power to take action or make changes, including the imposition of sanctions when necessary to ensure correction of deficiencies.

The Undersecretariat of Special Education of PRDE has designed and organized a monitoring unit which develops the monitoring process. The monitoring process is oriented toward compliance in applying Part B, of the "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act," and also compliance with dispositions of State Law #51, and other related state regulations and procedures.

The Monitoring Unit has organized a state monitoring team in which SEA staff, such as general supervisors and specialists participate. The activities are conducted through a continuous process, by which each level of the educational system (central level, educational regions and school districts), public agencies and private institutions are accountable for the quality of the services being offered to children, and youth with disabilities. The three (3) educational levels work in a collaborative model in a three (3) year cycle. The coordinator in charge of the monitoring activities in the central level is responsible for collecting all monitoring reports, organizing monitoring activities, developing the three year calendar of each monitoring team and conducting on-site visits.

During the first year of the cycle, the monitoring unit conducts premonitoring activities, on-site visits and post-monitoring activities. These activities consist of:

1. Revision of monitoring guides to be used at all levels.
2. Selection of state, regional and district monitoring teams.
3. Conduct training for teams.
4. Obtain and analyze information (statistics).
5. Review and analyze complaints from school districts.
6. Self-evaluation school districts and schools.
7. Selection of one third of the public schools, special schools, private schools and public institutions that provide Special Education services.
8. Development of state monitoring visit plan.
9. Send, by mail, a survey to a sample of at least five (5) parents of children with disabilities receiving services from each place to be visited.
10. Conduct on-site visits.
11. Develop report of findings.

12. Offer technical assistance.
13. Analysis and approval of the corrective action plans sent to the Monitoring Unit.

During the second year of the cycle, the activities are almost the same. The emphasis is on training and technical assistance to help in the development of the activities of the corrective action plans, on-site visits to another one third of the schools and follow-up visits.

In the third year, activities consist of a review of the effectiveness of corrective action plans, on-site visits, technical assistance, and the report to the Secretary of Education of those regions, school districts, schools and any other public institutions who have not complied with the established activities. The Secretary of Education will proceed with the administrative measures he may deem necessary.

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island Department of Education
Special Education Programs
Office of Special Needs
255 Westminster Street
Providence RI 02903

Telephone: (401) 277-4600, X-2309
Fax: (401)277-6030
E-Mail: ride0034@ride.ri.net

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Anne DeFanti
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Rhode Island Department of Health

Summary: In the last two years, the School Support System (SSS) has replaced the old system of monitoring special education. This new system of accountability, for the delivery of programs and services for students with disabilities, promotes the involvement of the whole school district; regular educators as well as special educators and parents. The SSS design appraises program effectiveness and student performance and determines if the school district complies with special education regulations.

When completed, the school district has a Support Plan detailing the technical assistance and training that is needed. This report describes domains of high performance and areas of non-compliance. The plan enables the schools and school districts to strengthen selected educational programs and correct essential areas.

The SSS has changed the way programs are monitored for students with disabilities. The changes involve information gathering and analysis; a focus on the student; and a final report of its Support Plan.

Information on the school district is collected and analyzed by the SSS team before visiting the district. School and district reports, staff questionnaires, census information, and consultant's knowledge of the districts' programs are discussed and recorded at this meeting. These results are the first step in writing the SSS Report.

Another new feature of the SSS is a student focus. Student records are selected at random. The SSS team reviews these records, phones the parents of the students, and observes the

students in their classrooms. In the review of student records, the consultant looks at the Individual Education Plan to determine if the student has made progress from one year to the next.

The school district and the SSS team jointly write a report detailing the findings, documentation, and the support plan. The final report describes quality programs and services. It also describes areas of noncompliance and how the school district will correct these deficiencies. The Support Plan details technical assistance and training. The plan enables the schools to strengthen selected educational programs and make corrections to essential areas. Resources are identified and made available to the school districts, and to the regional collaboratives in order to assist them in carrying out their support plans.

SOUTH CAROLINA

South Carolina State Department of Education
Office of Programs for Exceptional Children
702 Rutledge Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia SC 29201

Telephone: (803) 734-8318
Fax: (803) 734-6225
SEA Web Address: State.SC.US/sde

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** John Robinson
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health and Environmental Control

Summary: Each year, one-fourth (1/4) of the LEA/Agency programs for children with disabilities are selected for monitoring. Education Associates in the Office of Organizational Development are assigned to LEAs/Agencies and coordinate monitoring activities throughout the year. LEAs/Agencies selected for monitoring are notified and schedules for the monitoring visit are finalized.

Policies and procedures are submitted every four years, with annual updates required. Financial applications are submitted annually. Implementation of the approved policies and procedures is monitored during the on-site visits. Prior to monitoring, all LEAs/Agencies are provided with copies of sample policies, procedures, forms and the criteria used for determining compliance. Education Associates who will monitor LEAs/Agencies are trained annually.

Compliance status is based on a review of randomly selected student folders utilizing the Monitoring Sample Selection with a minimum of three (3) parent interviews, two (2) teacher interviews (one regular teacher and one teacher of children with disabilities), two (2) related service personnel interviews, two (2) classroom observations and two (2) administrator interviews (to include the LEA/Agency coordinator of programs for children with disabilities and one building principal). Further investigation is based on the professional judgment of the monitor.

All initial on-site monitoring visits are completed by November 30. The December 1 Count verification, parent interviews and any other monitoring activities required as a result of these interviews are completed on-site. Upon completion of all on-site monitoring visits, a formal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

letter and report are prepared. Where violations have occurred, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is included which includes specific requirements for documentation to be submitted. The Office of Technical Assistance offers up to five (5) technical assistance days to provide the LEA/Agency with the necessary guidance or training to implement the Corrective Action Plan. Upon completion of the CAP all documentation from the CAP is reviewed both on and off-site, as appropriate, and final compliance determined. A final letter of findings is sent to the Chief Administrative Officer of the LEA/Agency, with a copy to the Coordinator of Programs for Exceptional Children. In the event discrepancies remain, the LEA/Agency's funding under IDEA for the next fiscal year will be delayed until satisfactory completion of the CAP has occurred.

As a related activity, task forces of local coordinators, parents and other persons with expertise in categories of disabilities are in the process of completing recommendations for paperwork reduction, i.e., simplification of forms, policies and procedures. LEAs will have an option to either use or not use the sample forms, policies and procedures.

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota State Department of Education and Cultural Affairs
Office of Special Education
700 Governor's Drive
Pierre SD 57501-2291

Telephone:	(605) 773-3678
Fax:	(605) 773-6139
TTY:	(605) 773-6302
E-Mail:	robinc@deca.state.sd.us
SpecialNet:	SDAKOTASSE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Robin Cline
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** State Department of Education

Summary: South Dakota monitors all LEAs on a four year cycle. The monitoring process begins with the district/agency submitting in-depth presite information. Prior to the on-site visit, a survey of parents of children receiving special education services is sent to each parent with a child on an individual education plan. Comprehensive plans for special education are reviewed, along with child count information and personnel qualifications. An analysis of previous monitoring activity also is used in preparing to go on-site for monitoring. The on-site review is comprised of in-depth file reviews, staff interviews, and program observations. Also, as of the 1995-1996 monitoring year, a technical assistance component has been added to the on-site visits. The technical assistance component is described below.

Technical assistance through file reviews: During the file reviews, each special educator and/or administrator is invited to participate in a single file review. This person may bring a file that he/she has been involved with, or we can select a file. A member of the monitoring team and the special educator then review the file. The special educator or administrator is then able to see exactly what we, as reviewers, are looking for, and the reasons for the individual paperwork. Our office has received many positive comments about this technical assistance activity.

Upon completion of the on-site review, all information is reviewed and compiled by the review team. The summary findings are then produced in a standardized report format, complete with corrective actions that correspond to the findings. The first report sent to a school district/agency is the preliminary report. The school district/agency is then given two weeks to either agree with the findings or provide documentation that supports any disagreements with the findings. When this documentation is received, a final report is issued, and technical assistance is specified for all areas of concern found in the monitoring process.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee State Department of Education
Division of Special Education
8th Floor, Gateway Plaza
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville TN 37243-0375

Telephone:	(615) 532-6965
Fax:	(615) 532-9412
E-Mail:	hrepsher@mail.state.tn.us
SpecialNet:	TN.SE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Dr. Harry Repsher
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Office of Special Education

Summary: Tennessee utilizes a five year monitoring cycle. Child count verification is a component of the on-site monitoring process. Where problems are suspected or identified, we may use focused or targeted monitoring in addition to the regular cycle.

A monitoring instrument has been developed for use in monitoring private entities and some other state agencies because some standards in the regular instrument do not apply to a select group of agencies.

We are also involved in the development of a monitoring manual which should be helpful in training monitors and providing consistency in the monitoring process.

TEXAS

Texas Education Agency
Department of Special Education
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin TX 78701

Telephone:	(512) 463-9716
Fax:	(512) 475-3665
E-Mail:	fan@tenet.edu
SEA Web Address:	www.tea.state.tx.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Forrest Novy
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Council on Early Childhood Intervention

Summary: School districts and campuses across the state are accountable for meeting the state's standards of performance for students and for providing educational programs in accordance with federal and state statutes and regulations. The state's accountability system includes three types of on-site accountability evaluations designed to provide feedback for improvement. The on-site evaluations are conducted by trained peer evaluators who are guided by professional staff of the Department of Accountability and School Accreditation (DASA) of the Texas Education Agency (TEA).

One type of accountability evaluation, District Effectiveness and Compliance (DEC) involves conducting district on-site evaluations and monitoring compliance with state and federal requirements for special programs. Each district is scheduled for a visit on a cyclical basis. The DEC review focuses on requirements for compliance with state and federal statutes pertaining to students in programs for accelerated instruction, bilingual/English as a second language (ESL), career and technology education, gifted and talented, migrant education, optional extended year, special education, state compensatory education, and general state compliance requirements. Additionally, the review focuses on the district's planning and decision making policies and procedures; initiatives to improve performance for all student populations, including those served under special state and federal programs and significant factors that impact student performance. The on-site review process for students served in special education includes greater emphasis on document reviews to ensure compliance with federal and state requirements.

A peer evaluation process is established through comprehensive training sponsored annually by the Department of Accountability and School Accreditation. The training referred to as the Texas School Improvement Initiative (TSII) is conducted at different locale throughout the state each summer. Annually, more than one thousand local district personnel are trained as educational program evaluators. They subsequently are assigned to participate as peer evaluators, under the guidance of professional staff from DASA, in on-site accountability evaluations.

A Reference Guide for Special Education details the Compliance Indicators specific to the DEC System. This information is used by the Agency to guide its on-site review of a district's implementation of state and federal mandates for students receiving special education services. Each indicator identifies the requirements a district must address to be in compliance. Sources of information and documentation for indicators are provided, as well as notes to assist in determining a district's compliance status.

The guide may be used by a district as a self review. Review of these requirements by the Agency and district increases the likelihood that the DEC process functions as a catalyst for improved services to students.

Purposeful Sampling of Documentation: Some indicators call for a review of student files. To ensure that the sample selected is representative of the district's population of students receiving special education services. TEA, with assistance from the district, identifies a purposeful sample of students served in the district's program. Data used is the most recent available to the Agency. To ensure representativeness of the district's total special education population, the district ensures that students comprising the sample represent a set of critical program attributes or situations, disability type, ethnic status, instructional levels and private school enrollment, for example among the fourteen attributes.

In preparing for the DEC on-site review, the district is encouraged to review each of the indicators relative to its population of students receiving special education services. The district is then asked to identify those students whose programs are characterized by these attributes. The student eligibility folders selected during the on-site visit will be taken from these listings to ensure these fourteen (14) associated program attributes are represented.

Collecting Parent Information: The district is required to have systematic communication with parents of students regarding recommendations made by the district planning and decision making committee. The district might choose to obtain parent information through:

- a questionnaire mailed/sent to parents of students currently enrolled in special education;
- questions presented to parents at a formal meeting, during face-to-face interviews, by telephone survey, or at Admission, Review and Dismissal (ARD) committee meetings.
- a parent meeting conducted by campus improvement committees, campus or district planning committees, or an LEA's local special education advisory committee; or
- parent-teacher meetings conducted for the purpose of obtaining feedback about the district's special education program.

During the Agency on-site visit, a Parent Roundtable discussion is held with a representative sample of parents or guardians. Specific information is gathered regarding experiences of parents with the district's special education program.

The Agency currently contracts with an organization to assist in identifying qualified persons to implement the state's monitoring system. At present, 35 professionals, fulfill data gathering and data analysis responsibilities, including report generation, visit coordination, and follow-up visits.

UTAH

Utah State Office of Education
Special Education Services
Students At Risk
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City UT 84111

Telephone:	(801) 538-7711
Fax:	(801) 538-7991
E-Mail:	mtaylor@usoe.k12.ut.us
SEA Web Address:	www.usoe.k12.ut.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Dr. Mae Taylor-Sweeten
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Utah State Office of Education

Utah State University
1695 Research Parkway
North Logan UT 84341

- **Secondary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Dr. Margaret Lubke (Contractor)

Summary: Utah uses a contract monitoring arrangement and has done so for the past ten years. Four years ago we incorporated the monitoring of Safe and Drug Free Schools and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Youth in Custody to form a consolidated monitoring process. We use a computerized system to process all data and generate all reports.

Features that might be considered unique:

Utah was one of the first states to use contract monitoring. The database approach to processing the data is also somewhat unique.

Changes being considered: Beginning this year, data will be entered by scanning forms and using software that will enter the information directly into the databases. This will improve the efficiency and reliability of the data entry component of the monitoring process.

VERMONT

Vermont State Department of Education
Family and Educational Support Team
120 State Street
Montpelier VT 05620

Telephone:	(802) 828-51118 (Dennis Kane)
	(802) 828-3142 (Anita Rogers)
Fax:	(802) 828-3140
E-Mail:	arogers@doe.state.vt.us
SEA Web Address:	www.state.vt.us/educ/

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Dennis Kane and Anita Rogers
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Vermont Department of Health

Summary: Vermont's special education monitoring system includes: 1) on- site visits to verify implementation of IEPs and to interview principals, special educators, para educators, and classroom teachers; 2) review of students' special education records; 3) a survey of parents whose children receive special education services; and 4) the provision of technical assistance.

Unique Features: Vermont started looking at student outcomes in four of 12 supervisory unions monitored during the 1993-94 school year through the Act 230 evaluation process.

Considered Changes: There has been discussion about joint monitoring (Special Education, Chapter 1). If that goes smoothly, there is a possibility of expanding further (to include Technical Education, Child Nutrition, etc.).

Responses to Selected Items:

4a. There are three individuals who are responsible for monitoring the special education programs and services of Local Education Agencies. Private schools are monitored through our Independent School Approval process. Another staff person is responsible for this as a small portion of her job responsibilities. Chapter 1 monitoring is conducted by staff from another part of our team. A self assessment process is used.

9. We once used volunteers from the Vermont I-Team (Interdisciplinary Team) and VARC (Vermont Association of Retarded Citizens). We currently use volunteers from the LEAs that are going to be monitored the following year to assist in monitoring the current year LEAs.

10. The cycle for special education is six years. The cycle for Part C will be two years. The cycle for Chapter 1 is three years.

12. If there are significant concerns about a particular supervisory union/district, our procedures allow for a focused or targeted monitoring to investigate technical assistance around a particular issue.

13. For special education monitoring, LEAs are required to provide an LEA profile prior to monitoring. The profile requires LEAs to describe their programs, practices, staffing patterns, etc. The Corrective Actions issued often require an LEA to develop and implement a self-monitoring system for records (timelines, etc.).

15. The Vermont Department of Education and the Agency of Human Services are co-lead agencies for Part C. Monitoring procedures are currently being developed. The monitoring will be conducted jointly.

18. Technical assistance is provided in a variety of ways: at the time of the on-site monitoring visit; written attachments with the monitoring report; or specific training after the visit.

VIRGINIA

Virginia Department of Education
Division of Compliance
P O Box 6Q
Richmond VA 23218-2120

Telephone: (804) 225-2768
Fax: (804) 225-2831
E-Mail: sruffin@pen.k12.va.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Sandra E. Ruffin
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department for Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services

Summary: During the 1994-95 school year, the Virginia Department of Education restructured the state's monitoring system for K-12 programs in local school divisions. A cyclical monitoring schedule was devised whereby the state's 134 school divisions will enter the monitoring process every six years. The revised monitoring system provides an individualized approach to compliance monitoring for program improvement. The process allows the Department's monitoring staff to focus on major requirements that have greater impact on student achievement. The process involves three phases over a two to three-year period. Phase One requires school divisions to conduct a self-assessment; Phase Two requires data review and analysis by the Department of Education and on-site monitoring as needed; and Phase Three requires timely follow up and verification of corrective action.

The Division of Compliance and the Division of Instruction work cooperatively throughout the monitoring process to ensure the operation of an effective monitoring system. Staff from both divisions are available to provide school divisions with technical assistance upon request.

Phase One of the monitoring process requires school divisions to conduct a self-assessment of all federal and state requirements and to develop a Program Improvement or Corrective Action Plan if there are identified deficiencies. The Department of Education sponsors

monitoring institutes during the summer to provide school divisions direction in conducting the self-assessment and to allow ample time for completing the assessment. In addition, school divisions are provided a self-assessment instrument. School divisions are required to submit the completed document along with a signed assurance statement by the Division Superintendent to the Department of Education on or before May 15.

Phase Two of the monitoring process requires the Department's monitoring staff to review and analyze certain data for a profile of each school division. The data review and analysis involves the following pertinent information about the school division: (1) Self-Assessment and Program Improvement or Corrective Action Plan; (2) annual plan; (3) policies and procedures; (4) complaints and due process; (5) demographic data; (6) management of student records and annual notice; (7) noted concerns from Department staff and parents; and (8) previous monitoring and follow up reports. Upon completion of the division profile, a determination is made whether or not an on-site review is needed and the scope of the review. The on-site review may be categorized as a full review which calls for a review of all requirements; or a focused review, where it is determined that only certain requirements need further review. Focus areas for the review consist of requirements identified as statewide concerns and areas resulting from the school division's profile.

If deficiencies are identified, a mutually-agreed upon Program Improvement or Corrective Action Plan with timelines is required of the school divisions within 30 days of receipt of the Department's monitoring report. The on-site review also focuses on the implementation of corrective actions provided that the division identified deficiencies during Phase I of the process.

Phase Three of the monitoring process requires prompt follow up by the Department of Education on the implementation of Corrective Action Plans and on-site verification as needed. Correction Action Plans are monitored throughout the year to ensure that corrections of identified deficiencies are implemented by school divisions in a timely manner.

WASHINGTON

Washington State Department of Public Instruction
OSPI, Special Education
P O Box 47200
Olympia WA 98504-7200

Telephone:	(360) 753-6733
Fax:	(360) 586-0247
E-Mail	lweaver@inspire.ospi.wednet.edu
SEA Web:	www.ospi.wednet.edu/

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Leslie Weaver
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Social and Health Services

Summary: Beginning with the 1995-96 school year, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) revised its Special Education Compliance Verification System (SECVS). OSPI now utilizes a third party to plan the on-site visits, collect compliance verification data from its districts, and electronically transmit the data in report format to Olympia. The third party contractor, TRL Monitoring, is located in Utah. (TRL has hired three full time employees for the Washington project. However, the organization has the capability to add fractions of

FTE as needed. The number of Washington consultants working during the visit weeks is dependent on the size of the district.)

OSPI staff select which districts will be visited each year (approximately one-third) develop/revise the monitoring tools (Source Book, Classroom Visitation Interview, Parent Survey (in five languages) and Administrator Interview which were approved by our OSEP liaison); co-train (with TRL Utah staff) the consultants (all of whom are Washington residents and most are former educators); notify each superintendent of the proposed week of the visit; edit and issue the individual student report and interim report including draft corrective action plan; respond to any challenges to the findings; issue the final report; and verify completion of any corrective actions. Currently, the reports are sent to the districts on computer disk. The eventual goal is to transmit all correspondence and reports electronically.

TRL Utah staff plan the on-site visit which includes contacting the districts by telephone and mail. Some of the activities completed during the previsit phase include setting up the on-site schedules selecting the teachers who will be interviewed, making travel and lodging arrangements for the consultants and preparing materials for use on-site.

Onsite the TRL consultants conduct entrance and exit meetings, interview teachers and administrators, and review randomly selected student educational records. In addition, parent surveys are given to the district special education administrator to mail to the parents of the students whose files are reviewed. The parents received the survey along with a stamped envelope which is addressed to the TRL Utah address. The data collected on-site is sent to Utah where it is verified for a second time (the team leader verifies the data before leaving the district) and then entered into the database program which generates individual student records and an interim report. When the reports are completed, they are transmitted electronically to OSPI. The parent surveys are tabulated by the TRL Utah staff and the summaries are electronically transmitted to OSPI. Parents are given 30 days to respond.

At the end of the SECVS year, TRL Utah staff provide a final report summarizing the findings for all districts visited during the year. The final report is electronically transmitted to OSPI.

WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia State Department of Education
Office of Special Education
Building 6; - Room 304
1900 Kanawha Boulevard East
Charleston WV 25305-0330

Telephone:	(304) 558-2696 (V/TDD)
Fax:	(304) 558-3741
E-Mail:	kayjohnston@access.k12.wv.us

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Kay Johnston
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health and Human Resources

Summary: The Office of Special Education is responsible for monitoring all public and private programs which provide special education and related services to publicly funded students with disabilities, on a four year cycle. Prior to monitoring, all districts and agencies are provided with copies of the procedures, forms and criteria used in determining

compliance. Technical assistance is provided to districts and agencies upon request, prior to on-site visits and following on-site visits.

Compliance status is based on completion of an administrative checklist which includes a financial review, a review of randomly selected students' folders, and interviews conducted with parents, administrators, teachers and related services personnel. Training for local and county education personnel, Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA) coordinators, and State Department staff who will serve on monitoring teams occurs annually.

Upon completion of all on-site monitoring visits, a formal letter and report is issued. The report addresses exemplary programs, violations of policy and regulations, and a corrective action plan (CAP) which includes specific requirements for documentation to be submitted. Failure to develop an approvable CAP, or failure to implement the agreed upon actions within timelines results in enforcement procedures being initiated.

WISCONSIN

Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction
Division for Learning Support
Post Office Box 7841
Madison WI 53707-7841

Telephone: (608) 267-3720
Fax: (608) 267-3746
SEA Web Address: www.state.wi.us/agencies/dpi/een

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Jack Frye-Osier
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Department of Health and Family Services

Summary: Wisconsin monitors each public agency responsible for the provision of a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) to children with disabilities to ensure the establishment and implementation of all the procedural requirements in state and federal special education laws. Monitoring for establishment of the procedural requirements occurs during the review of each agency's application for federal flow-through funding. Comprehensive monitoring for implementation of the requirements occurs on-site in every agency once every 6 years. For every agency to be monitored, the department carefully selects a sample of special education records to be reviewed which accurately represents the total population of students with disabilities in the agency. Currently, the monitoring procedures require a sample review of all the special education requirements in 10% of the agency's records, and review of the requirements related solely to individualized education programs (IEPs) in the other 90% of the records. When an implementation error is found for a requirement during the comprehensive review of the 10% portion of the sample, that requirement is included in the review of the 90% portion of the sample until the criterion for citation is reached. The criterion for citation of a procedural error is that the error must be found in at least 10% of the records reviewed. The existing monitoring process also includes structured interviews of agency staff, parents, and adult students. Technical assistance concerning interpretation and implementation of the laws is provided to district staff informally throughout the interview process, and in greater detail during summary discussions at a meeting with agency staff at the conclusion of the on-site activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In response to the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the department has requested from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) permission to refocus our monitoring during the 1997-98 school year. Our current monitoring procedures focus in large degree upon detailed procedural reviews in one-sixth of the agencies annually. However, we propose to refocus the content and the scope of our monitoring efforts in the 1997-98 school year to assist all agencies in the state to understand the changes that must be made to comply with new requirements. Through a statewide inservice initiative, the department proposes to assist agencies to implement the procedural and systems changes necessary to implement the new requirements. The department is also currently involved in revisions to state special education statutes and rules. During the 1997-98 school year, that effort will continue and we will make the necessary revisions to our monitoring process and tools.

WYOMING

Wyoming State Department of Education
Special Programs Unit
Hathaway Building, 2nd Floor
Cheyenne WY 82002-0050

Telephone:	(307) 777-6257
Fax:	(307) 777-6234
E-Mail:	thoward@educ.state.wy.us
SEA Web Address:	www.k12.wy.us
SpecialNet:	WY.SE

- **Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:** Terri Howard
- **Agency that Monitors Part C:** Wyoming Department of Health
  Division of Developmental Disabilities

Summary:

The off-site monitoring process consists of:

1. Review of policies and procedures
2. Review of EHA Title VI-B application
3. Review of 401 state expenditures
4. Review of latest child count
5. Review of complaints and hearings
6. Review of previous monitoring/corrective action plan

The on-site monitoring process consists of:

1. Entrance meeting
2. Interviews with special education director and staff
3. Verification of policies and procedures
4. Review of district special education forms
5. Review of student records
6. Building tours and classroom observation

The review of student records includes completion of forms, proper notices, proper assessments, proper eligibility, parental input, LRE placement, and complete IEP.

In addition, the on-site process consists of:

1. Review of Title VI-B project
2. Review of fiscal records, including title VI-B expenditures, (salaries/benefits, contract expenditures/documentation, and time/effort)
3. Review of child identification
4. Reverification of annual child count
5. Review of personnel development
6. Verification of complaint/hearing implementation
7. Exit meeting/report
8. Corrective action plan

MATERIALS MATRIX

		AR	AZ	BIA	CA	CO	CT	DE	FL	GA	GU	IL	IN	KS
a	Materials on follow-up, corrective action and technical assistance.		•	•	•	•	•	•		•			•	•
b	Materials using unique or "state of the art" techniques in monitoring.			•						•				•
c	Materials for monitoring the IEP.		•		•			•	•			•		•
d	Materials to develop interpretive standards, define required documentation and/or maintain consistency among monitors.	•		•		•			•			•		
e	Materials on "monitoring and the school reform movement."				•									•
f	Materials to help other unitary SEAs conduct monitoring.				•			•			•		•	•
g	Materials helpful in monitoring outcomes.				•									•
h	Sample copies of technical assistance documents.		•						•	•				
i	Other (see Materials Available)											•		

		KY	LA	MD	MI	MO	MT	NC	ND	NE	NH	NY	OH
a	Materials on follow-up, corrective action and technical assistance.	•					•	•	•				
b	Materials using unique or "state of the art" techniques in monitoring.				•				•			•	
c	Materials for monitoring the IEP.		•		•			•	•				•
d	Materials to develop interpretive standards, define required documentation and/or maintain consistency among monitors.	•		•		•				•			
e	Materials on "monitoring and the school reform movement."										•	•	
f	Materials to help other unitary SEAs conduct monitoring.				•						•		
g	Materials helpful in monitoring outcomes.										•	•	
h	Sample copies of technical assistance documents.	•					•		•	•			•
i	Other (see Materials Available)	•	•										

		OK	PA	PR	RI	SD	TN	TX	UT	VT	VA	WA	WV	WI
a	Materials on follow-up, corrective action and technical assistance.		•					•	•		•		•	•
b	Materials using unique or "state of the art" techniques in monitoring.	•	•					•	•	•				•
c	Materials for monitoring the IEP.	•			•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•
d	Materials to develop interpretive standards, define required documentation and/or maintain consistency among monitors.						•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
e	Materials on "monitoring and the school reform movement."				•			•		•				
f	Materials to help other unitary SEAs conduct monitoring.			•	•		•	•	•		•		•	
g	Materials helpful in monitoring outcomes.							•		•				
h	Sample copies of technical assistance documents.							•	•	•	•		•	•
i	Other (see Materials Available)													

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OTHER MATERIALS/TA DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE

California

- Corrective Tracking Action
- IEP Training Manual
- SBCP Challenge Standards Training Manual
- Unitary SEA Training Manual
- IPI-4 Guidance Document

Illinois

- Illinois Monitoring Manual

Kentucky

- Monitoring Manual

Louisiana

- Administrative Procedures Checklist
- School Staff Interview form
- Summary of Findings form

Ohio

- Sample copy of Parent Notice
- Sample copy of IEP Road Map

Texas

- District Effectiveness and Compliance
- Reference Guide for Special Education

West Virginia

- Sample copy of Developing Quality IEPs

Wisconsin

- Monitoring Procedures
- Sample Policy documents
- Monitoring document
- Interpretive Standards

PROFILES OF STATE MONITORING SYSTEMS
Regional Resource Center Programs

Purpose:
This information is being collected to prepare a resource document for use by SEA staff responsible for developing and improving SEA program monitoring systems for infants, children and youth with disabilities. The document will include a matrix that serves as a quick index to the characteristics of state systems plus some contact and narrative information. It will be distributed to all 58 states and jurisdictions currently receiving Federal Special Education funds and to other interested organizations and agencies.

Directions:

- Please complete this form and include a brief narrative describing your monitoring system and its unique features (1/2 to 1 1/2 pages).
- Your answers should describe your monitoring system as of July, 1997. If you are planning changes, please indicate so in item #40 and in the brief narrative.
- Please mail or fax your responses to your Regional Resource Center contact person by July 23, 1997.

Contact Information:

Current Date:_____

State:_____

Name of Primary Contact for SEA Monitoring:_____

SEA Unit:_____

Address:_____

_____

City:_____ State:_____ Zip:_____

Phone #:_____ Fax #:_____

EMail:_____ SEA Web Address:_____

Demographics:

1 Number of entities that must be monitored: a) LEAs_____ b) IEUs_____

c) Other State Entities_____ d) Charter Schools_____ e) Other Private Entities_____

2 IDEA child count taken December 1, 1996 for ages 3 - 21: _____

3 Name of agency that monitors Part C (formerly H):_____

Staffing:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff employed for monitoring (Note: 1.0 FTE might represent several people part time)

4 a Located in SEA Central Office:_____ FTE

4 b Located elsewhere: _____ FTE Where?:_____

Personnel Used as part of Monitoring Team(s) include:

5	SEA staff (regardless of office location)	Y	N
6	LEA peers	Y	N
7	Parents	Y	N
8	Others (e.g., IHE faculty, contracted personnel) (If yes, please specify in state narrative)	Y	N

Process and Materials

9	Our current cycle (in years) for comprehensive on-site visits is _____ years		
10	Child count verification is part of our on-site process	Y	N
11	We use focused/targeted monitoring (If yes, briefly describe in state narrative)	Y	N
12	LEA self-monitoring is a part of our process	Y	N
13	IDEA monitoring is conducted in conjunction with other SEA monitoring; i.e. consolidated monitoring (If yes, please describe in narrative)	Y	N
14	Our monitoring is conducted in conjunction with the Part C Lead Agency	Y	N
15	Our monitoring goes beyond legal obligations to include program quality/effectiveness	Y	N
16	Our monitoring goes beyond legal obligations to include student outcomes/results (If yes, please describe in state narrative)	Y	N
17	We provide TA as a formal part of our monitoring process (If yes, briefly describe details in state narrative)	Y	N
18	We formally collect information from parents (e.g., via surveys, interviews, public forums)	Y	N
19	We use a computer database of LEA data for off-site monitoring	Y	N
20	We use computers during the on-site process	Y	N

21	We generate our reports using computer templates	Y	N
22	LEA application review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	N
23	LEA policy/procedure review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	N
24	LEA interagency agreements review is a part of our monitoring process	Y	N
25	We use sanctions other than fiscal sanctions	Y	N
26	We have written interpretive standards for assessing compliance	Y	N
27	We have written criteria for selecting LEAs to be monitored	Y	N
28	We have an instruction/training manual for monitors	Y	N
29	We use a consistent sampling formula for selecting student records	Y	N
30	We conduct follow-up monitoring	Y	N

Forms

31	We have standardized forms available for LEA adoption	Y	N
32	We have and use an LEA policy and procedure review form	Y	N
33	Our IEP record review form goes beyond compliance issues	Y	N
34	We have and use interview forms designed specifically for monitoring	Y	N
35	We have and use mail or telephone survey forms	Y	N
36	We have and use a summary checklist (to integrate findings)	Y	N
37	We have and use a standardized monitoring report/narrative format	Y	N

Changes

38	We have made adaptations in our monitoring process to address unique early childhood issues (Section 619/preschool, Part C to Part B transition)	Y	N
39	We have made adaptations in our monitoring system to include Part C (formerly H) monitoring	Y	N
40	We are making or considering major revisions to our monitoring system	Y	N

Narrative Summary

Please provide a summary of the key elements of your system, including information related to items (8, 11, 13, 16, 17) limiting yourself to approximately one half to one and a half pages. Please cover the following in your narrative: 1) Overview of the system (general procedures/ approach), 2) Features that might be considered unique, 3) Changes being considered.

Please indicate materials on the following topics that you are willing to share on request:

_____a Materials that might help others improve systems of follow-up, corrective action and technical assistance

_____b Materials that might help others to use unique or "state of the art" techniques in monitoring (e.g., technology, linking cyclical with focused monitoring, data bases)

_____c Materials that might help others to monitor the IEP

_____d Materials that might help others to develop interpretive standards, define required documentation and/or maintain consistency among monitors

_____e Materials that might help others with the issue of "monitoring and the school reform movement" (e.g., in restructured SEAs)

_____f Materials that might help other unitary SEAs (SEAs which are also LEAs) to conduct monitoring

_____g Materials that might help others in monitoring for outcomes

_____h Sample copies of technical assistance documents (please specify):

_____i Other (please specify):

Please remember: Send or call in your responses to your Regional Resource Center contact person by July 23, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE